00111855

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 September, 2015

COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

BY

KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, D.D. PH.D.,

PROFESSOR OF EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY AND THE ORIENTAL LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DORPAT.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MURPHY, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, BELFAST.

111855

SUPPLEMENTED BY

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

BY

ERNST BERTHEAU,

PROFESSOR IN GOETTINGEN.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MARTIN, B.A.,

EDINBURGH.

VOLUME II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON, AND HODGES AND SMITH.

MDCCCLVII.

God
222.507
Kei/Com
111855

CONTENTS.

SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.—(*Continued*).

Page.

CHAP. XIII.—Reign of King Jehoahaz, vv. 1—9, and Joash of Israel, vv. 10—13, and 22—25. Death of Elisha, vv. 14—21, . . . 1

CHAP. XIV.—Reign of Amaziah King of Judah, vv. 1—22, comp. 2 Chr. xxv., and of Jeroboam II. of Israel, vv. 23—29, . . . 9

CHAP. XV.—Reign of Azariah or Uzziah King of Judah, vv. 1—7, and of several Kings of Israel, vv. 8—38, ... 19

CHAP. XVI.—Reign of Ahaz, King of Judah. Comp. 2 Chr. xxviii. . 34

CHAP. XVII.—Reign of Hoshea, the last King of Israel, taking of Samaria and removal of the Israelites to Assyria and Media by Shalmaneser, vv. 1—6; reflections on the fall of the Kingdom of Israel, vv. 7—23; and transplanting of Heathen Colonists into the depopulated territory, vv. 24—41, ... 50

SECTION THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

CHAP. XVIII.—Reign of King Hezekiah, vv. 1—12. Sennacherib's Expedition against Judah and Jerusalem, vv. 13—37, . . . 78

CHAP. XIX.—Delivery of Jerusalem and liberation of Judah from the Assyrians. Comp. Is. xxxvii., ... 93

CHAP. XX.—Sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, vv. 1—11. Arrival of a Babylonian Embassy at Jerusalem, vv. 12—19. Hezekiah's death, vv. 20, 21, ... 112

CHAP. XXI.—Reign of Manasseh, vv. 1—18, comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 1—20; and of Amon, vv. 19—26; comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 21—25, . . . 123

CHAP. XXII.—XXIII. 30.—Reign of King Josiah, vv. 1, 2; Discovery of the Book of the Law on the occasion of repairing the Temple, vv. 3—20; reading of the Law in the Temple and renewal of the Covenant with the Lord, ch. xxiii. 1—3; abolition of Idolatry and solemnization of the Passover, vv. 4—24; and of Josiah's reign, vv. 25—30, . . 131

CHAP. XXIII. 31—XXIV. 17.—Reign of King Jehoahaz, vv. 31-35, of Jehoiakim, v. 36—ch. xxiv. 7, and Jehoiachin, vv. 8—17, . 158

CHAP. XXIV. 18—20 and XXV.—Reign of Zedekiah, and fall of the Kingdom of Judah, ch. xxiv. 18, xxv. 26. Subsequent fate of Jehoiachin, vv. 27—30, ... 172

SECOND BOOK OF KINGS

CHAPTER XIII.

REIGN OF KING JEHOAHAZ, VV. 1—91, AND JOASH OF ISRAEL; VV. 10—13, and 22—25. DEATH OF ELISHA, VV. 14—21.

V. 1. "In the 23d year of Joash, king of Judah, Jehoahaz became king over Israel in Samaria seventeen years." This statement is in contradiction with v. 10, and does not agree well with earlier synchronistic statements. If Jehoahaz became king in the 23d year of Joash, king of Judah, and reigned seventeen years, his son Joash cannot after his death have succeeded him on the throne in the 37th year of Joash of Judah, as is stated v. 10. For even should we assume with Vatabl., Grot., Calm., and others, that Joash became king in the very beginning of the 23d year, and his son Jehoahaz only at the close of the 37th year of king Joash of Judah, Jehoahaz would still not have reigned *full* fifteen years, which could not possibly be counted as seventeen years: since, if the beginning of his reign fell in the beginning of the year, his first year would exactly agree with the 23d year of Joash, whereby the 37th of Joash of Judah must have coincided at least in part with the fourteenth of his reign. The solution of Ussher (*Annal. vt. ad a.m.* 3163), Lightfoot (*Opp.* i. 90), Budd. (*hist. eccl.* ii. 401 f.), Seb. Schm. and several Rabbins (comp. Meyer *Annott. ad Sed. ol.* p. 944), that Jehoahaz had assumed his son Joash as co-regent two or three years before his death, appears at once to be a make-shift, and a product of the difficulty, as it contradicts the clear words of vv.

9 and 10, according to which Joash became king only after his father's death. Our statement, however, is at variance not only with v. 10, but with xii. 2. For as Jehu ascended the throne at the same time with Athaliah, and Joash of Judah became king in the seventh year of Jehu, according to which Athaliah reigned nearly six full years; the end of the twenty-eight years' reign of Jehu (x. 36) must fall in the 22d year of Joash of Judah, unless we choose to assume, contrary to the fixed principle of our author, to reckon the incomplete years as complete, that Jehu reigned longer than twenty-eight years, or to agree to the improbable assumption of Seb. Schm., that between the death of Jehu, and the commencement of the reign of his successor, several weeks or months elapsed. All these difficulties and contradictions disappear, as soon as we assume an error in our verse, and put instead of the 23d the 22d year of Joash. Then Jehu reigned twenty-seven years and some months, which as in all the other kings are stated as twenty-eight years, and Jehoahaz may have reigned from the 22d to the 37th year of Joash of Judah from fifteen to nearly sixteen years, which, according to the principle above developed in the introduction to 1 Ki. xii namely to reckon the years of the kings according to Nisan, and thus count the weeks and months before as well as after Nisan as full years, would make out a reign of seventeen years.[1]

Vv. 2—9. As Joash, walking wholly in the footsteps of his predecessors, continued the illegal calf-worship introduced by Jero-

[1] Instead of the number twenty-three we might also put twenty-one; for as the first year of the Jewish Joash coincides with the seventh of Jehu (xii. 1), the beginning of the twenty-eighth year of Jehu might possibly fall in the end of the twenty-first year of the Jewish Joash. The reign of Jehoahaz continuing from the twenty-first to the thirty-seventh year of Joash might then still more easily be said to amount to seventeen years. So Josephus has amended our text (Ant. ix. 8, 5); for that he should have found this number in it is not a probable supposition, for this reason, that the LXX., as well as all the old versions, agree with the Masoretic text in the number twenty-three. *Des Vignoles* (chronol. i. p. 347 ff.) and Winer (R.W. i. 687 f.) assume an error in v. 10, referring to the fact that the date contained in v. 1 harmonizes with the duration of Jehu's reign, but in v. 10 the LXX. have, according to *edit. Ald.*, actually thirty-nine instead of thirty-seven But in reference to v. 1 we have above in the text proved the contrary and the reading of the *edit. Ald.* of the LXX. in v. 10 is nothing more than an arbitrary emendation of no critical import.

boam (v. 2), the Lord chastised Israel still more under his reign than under his predecessor Jehu. The longer the sin was continued, the greater the revolt, so much the severer must have been the punishment. The instruments the Lord employed as scourges for Israel were Hazael and his son Benhadad, who oppressed the kingdom of Israel so severely that only 50 horsemen, 10 chariots, and 10,000 footmen were left to Jehoahaz. When, as the oppression rose to the highest, Jehoahaz besought the Lord and was heard, God the Lord gave Israel a saviour, so that they were released from the hand of the Syrians, and again dwelt peacefully in their tents as before time, although they departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, and the Asherah also stood in Samaria.—On the sing. suff. in מִמֶּנָּה v. 2 and בָּהּ v. 6 comp. on iii. 3. The change of בָּהּ into בָּם in Dathe is arbitrary. V. 3. כָּל־הַיָּמִים "the whole time," namely, of the reign of Jehoahaz. Many expositors limit these words: *nearly*, almost during his whole reign (Seb. Sch., J. D., Mich., d. exeg. Hand.); but vv. 4 and 5 do not warrant this. The saviour (מוֹשִׁיעַ v. 5) given to the kingdom of Israel at the prayer of Jehoahaz is neither an angel, nor the prophet Elisha, as some think, nor *quidam e ducibus Joasi* (Seb. Schm., Budd. *h. eccl.* ii. 402), nor are we to understand thereby a victory gained by Jehoahaz over the Syrians, but the Lord gave Israel a saviour in the two successors of Jehoahaz, in the kings Joash and Jeroboam, of whom the former recovered from the Syrians all the cities taken from his father (v. 25), the latter restored the old boundaries of Israel (xiv. 25.) For that Israel did not obtain deliverance from the Syrian yoke under Jehoahaz, but that the Lord had mercy on them first under Joash and Jeroboam, and by these kings granted them victory over their enemies, is said in the most explicit manner in vv. 22—25 and xiv. 26 f. According to these clear expressions must the indefinite statements of vv. 4 and 5 be understood, especially as the reference of the passages quoted to these verses cannot be mistaken. But from the comparison of those passages with our verses it follows at the same time that the oppression which, according to v. 3, Hazael's son Benhadad exercised over Israel falls in the time of his father's reign, and thus that Benhadad is named, not as king, but as general under his father Hazael. For,

according to v. 24, the alleviation of the Syrian yoke took place simultaneously with the death of Hazael, who died, not under Jehoahaz but under Joash, whereupon Joash wrested their conquests again from the Syrians. Therefore also in v. 4 only a מֶלֶךְ אֲרָם is mentioned. Concerning חֹלֶה פָּנִים (v. 4) see on 1 Ki. xiii. 6. When it is said, v. 4, "God heard him," we may not surely, with Meyer, *ad Sed. Ol.* p. 943, affirm the contrary: *iratam faciem Domini quidem deprecatus est, sed non exauditus*, but certainly assume, that the hearing did not take place immediately, that is, the aid did not come under him, but under his son, as the phrase כל־הימים (v. 3) and v. 22 ff. imperatively demand. וַיֵּצְאוּ מִתַּחַת "they went out from under the hand of Aram," that is, they were released from the power of the Syrians, were delivered from their oppression, and attained again to the enjoyment of the blessings of peace. "And the children of Israel dwelt (sat) in their tents as yesterday and ere yesterday," that is, they were able to dwell again in peace in their houses as formerly, without being driven out and carried away by their enemies.—V. 6. בָּהֶם הָלָךְ "therein (in the sin of Jeroboam) walked *he*," that is, Jehoahaz, or *it*, that is, Israel. Concerning the form וְגַם־הָאֲשֵׁרָה, which Hitzig (Begr. d. krit. p. 135) unnecessarily explains as an error of transcription, compare on 1 Ki. xxi. 21; on the אֲשֵׁרָה see on 1 Ki. xiv. 23. This idol had probably remained from Ahab's times (1 Ki. xvi. 33) as its destruction by Jehu is not mentioned.—V. 7 has given much trouble to the expositors. C. a Lap. wished to connect it with v. 3 and place it before v. 4. Houbigant and Dathe have actually placed it after v. 4. כִּי must, according to Schulz and the exeg. Hdb. *plane abundare*, according to Cler., signify *sed*. All this is arbitrary. The verse stands in its right place, כִּי means for, and is in substance attached to vv. 4 and 5, while v. 6 contains only a thought subordinate to v. 5, for which reason Seb. Schm. would put it in a parenthesis. The connection of thoughts is simply[1] this: Jehoa-

[1] Maurer has determined the order of thought in vv. 6 and 7 much too artificially, and even falsely thus: *tamen non recesserunt a peccatis Jerobeami cet. tamen constanter neglexerunt Jovam, vs. 7. nam Jova facta facere infecta non poterat, Israelitis tantum imbecillum auxilium tulerat.*

haz besought the Lord, and the Lord heard him, for he saw their oppression . . . . and gave them a saviour . . . . although they departed not from their sins (v. 6); for Israel was come to an extremity; he (Jehovah) had left to Jehoahaz not more than fifty horsemen . . . . for the king of the Syrians had destroyed them (the remaining horsemen, chariots, and footmen.) That "he had made them like the dust in threshing," denotes their total annihilation, Is. xxi. 10; Mic. iv. 12 f.; Jer. li. 33. The figurative expression here, however, had contained partly a literal truth; for according to Am. i. 3, Hazael had drawn threshing instruments of iron over the Gileadites, according to a barbaric custom of war, of which examples occur elsewhere, comp. 2 Sam. viii. 31; Judg. viii. 7.

Vv. 10—13.—*The beginning, duration, and character of the reign of Joash* (יוֹאָשׁ or יְהוֹאָשׁ) *in Israel.* On the beginning of his reign see the remarks on v. 1.—On v. 11 comp. v. 2 and 6.—The war of Joash with Amaziah, indicated v. 12, is related xiv. 8—14. The standing formula for the end of every reign is, in the case of Joash, placed too early in vv. 12 and 13, and recurs in xiv. 15 f., interwoven with the history of the reign of the Jewish king, there still less suitably, although it stands here in the wrong place, and should properly follow at the close of the chapter.

Vv. 14—19. Under Joash "Elisha fell sick of his sickness whereof he was to die." *Quemadmodum unicuique homini suus morbus et mors destinata; sic etiam Elisa tandem juxta sortem generis humani aegrotavit lethaliter; estque tacita oppositio inter Jesum et Eliam, qui vivus in cœlum ascendit.* Seb. Schm. On the news of the mortal sickness of the prophet, the king came down to him,—the place where Elisha lay sick and died is not named,—and "wept over his face." These words are certainly not with Cler., Schulz, and others, to be thus understood: *dum eum jacentem oscularetur, lacrimas profudit,* but merely to be taken in the sense, he wept standing before him, literally, over him lying. The king believed that after the death of the prophet he must encounter the danger threatening his kingdom from the Syrians, and therefore exclaims, "My father, my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Comp. in regard

to these words on ii. 12. From this lamentation of the king over the approaching death of the prophet, it appears that Joash was not altogether without trust and faith. *Serius*, Seb. Schm. rightly remarks, *putamus fuisse has lacrimas, nec hypocriticas nisi quod non perrexerit in seria poenitentia.* This faith, though weak, the Lord accepted and comforted him by a cheering promise of the dying prophet. In order to help the weak faith of the king, the promise is connected with a symbolic action. "Take bow and arrows, lay thy hand upon the bow, open the window eastward and shoot," said Elisha to him, and after the king had taken the bow in his hand, laid his hands upon the hands of the king in token of the power granted to the bow-shot coming from the Lord through the medium of the prophet, and added on the discharge of the arrow: "An arrow of deliverance from the Lord and an arrow of deliverance against the Syrians! and thou wilt smite the Syrians in Aphek to destruction." The discharged arrow was to be a symbol of the help of the Lord against the Syrians to their utter overthrow. This promise the king was now by his own act to appropriate. Elisha therefore desired him to shoot the remaining arrows to the ground, and the king did so, but stopped after shooting the third arrow, and thereby displayed the weakness of his faith. For when it was said to him, that the discharged arrow signified a victory over the Syrians, it was evident of itself that the more arrows he shot, the greater deliverance, the more victories would he obtain. When, therefore, he stopped so soon, the reason could only lie in this, that he, doubting the omnipotence of God to fulfil his promise, regarded three victories as the *maximum*, which the Lord could or would give him.[1] The prophet, therefore, was justly indignant with the weak faith of the king, and declared to him that he had only by the unbelief he had herein displayed, deprived himself of the complete victory over the Syrians. By this distinction between the objective promise and its subjective appropriation, the apparent contradiction between v. 17 and 19 disappears,

[1] *Cum rex apud animum suum potentiam Syriae regum reputaret, nec fidem prorsus haberet Elisaeo, satis esse credidit, si ter feriret terram, veritus ut vaticinium impleretur, si plures ictus terrae impingeret. Cler.*

which S. Schm. and Cler. endeavoured to explain in a very unsatisfactory manner by referring עַד־כָּלֶה (v. 17) *sensu strictiori* to the army of the Syrians, in v. 19 on the contrary *sensu latiori* to the kingdom and nation of the Syrians. The arrow shot through the window under the laying on of Elisha's hands symbolized the promise objectively made to Joash, the arrows shot by Joash at the word of the prophet to the ground, represented the subjective appropriation of this promise.[1]—V. 16. הַרְכֵּב יָדְךָ עַל הַקֶּ֫שֶׁת "lay thine hand upon the bow." הִרְכִּיב to cause to ride, go, then, to load (2 Sam. vi. 3), accordingly here, to lay on, as more frequently in Syr. and Arab. Comp. *L. de Dieu ad h. l.* and Ges. *thes.* iii. 1287.—V. 17. "Open the window eastward, or toward the east," probably with reference to this, that the Syrians had established themselves in the East, had taken all Gilead, x. 32 f. תְּשׁוּעָה salvation, see on v. 1. בַּאֲרָם in, upon Aram, that is, towards Aram, comp. Ew. Gr. § 521.—On the situation of Aphek comp. on 1 Ki. xx. 26.—V. 18. הַךְ אַרְצָה "smite on the earth," that is, shoot the arrow to the earth. Comp. on this meaning of הַכָּה, iii. 25, ix. 24; 1 Ki. xxii. 34; 1 Sam. xvii. 49 f.—V. 19. לְהַכּוֹת to smite, it behoved thee to smite . . . , then wouldst thou . . . Comp. Ew. Gr. § 544.

Vv. 20, 21. Even after his death Elisha was proved by a miracle to be a prophet of the Lord, in order to put the seal upon the truth of his announcements, especially his last still unfulfilled prediction concerning the conquest of the Syrians, comp. Sir. 48, 12—14. In the next year after the death of Elisha the inhabitants of the city, in the vicinity of which the prophet was buried, brought out a dead man to bury him. By the way they saw a marauding party of Moabites advancing, and opened, in order to retreat from them as speedy as possible, the grave of Elisha, which was at hand, and put the body into it with all haste. But as soon as the deceased touched the body of Elisha, he revived and stood up on his feet. Among the

[1] Quite arbitrary is the conjecture of Köster (i. p. q. p. 98): "perhaps the plurality of arrows is intended, as in the well-known story of the dying father, to express the harmony of the two kingdoms."

Israelites the dead were neither enclosed in coffins nor covered with earth, but only wrapt in linen cloth and laid in tombs, so that one body might touch another, and, on returning to life, would not be hindered from moving. Now, with regard to this miracle, it was not the dead body of Elisha, but the living God, that gave life again to the dead; and the effect of the Divine omnipotence was only brought about by contact with the dead Elisha, and was connected with him, because God wished thereby to show his people, that the Divine efficiency that was at work in Elisha had not disappeared from Israel with his death. The special object of the miracle indeed was this, to convince in the most effectual manner people and king of the truth of the promise of the victory over the Syrians, which the dying Elisha had announced to king Joash by the laying of his hands upon the hands of the king.[1] The narrator intimates this object, when immediately after the account of this miracle he records the historical fulfilment of that promise (vv. 22—25.) The difficult בָּהּ שָׁנָה is mostly rendered with Maurer, "the year came," for, "when the year came." The LXX. and Chald. express this sense; on the contrary the Vulg. and Syr., *in ipso anno*, as if they had read בַּשָּׁנָה. At all events Ewald's explanation is to be rejected; "they were wont to come in the coming of the year (בֹּא *infin.*), a yearly coming" (Krit. Gr. p. 528), less on account of the change of text, as on account of the sense not suiting the context.—וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ means not, "they cast," as if they had flung the body into the grave, but, they deposited it with all haste.—The phrase וַיִּלָּוֶד belongs to the descriptive, as it were pictorial style, the dead came and touched = as the dead came to the bones of Elisha, he touched them. Quite unsuitable

[1] Many from Ephraim Syr. and Pseudo-epiphan. *de proph. c.* 6 to Köster erroneously assign as the object of this miracle, to show that Elisha even in the grave surpassed his master Elijah in miraculous power, or that he was able to do wonders in the grave, because he possessed the spirit of Elijah in a twofold measure. But the spirit and object of this miracle are completely mistaken by the rationalists, who with Bauer (hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 197), the exeg. Hdb. and Jahn (Einl. ii. 1, p. 261) pronounce the deceased to be one apparently dead, who, when he was cast into Elisha's grave, was brought to his senses and restored to animation by the rough shock of the severe fall.

therefore is the conjecture of Hitzig וַיִּלְבּוּ (Begr. d. Krit. p. 127.)

Vv. 22—25. With v. 22 comp. vv. 4 and 7 and the remarks there. *Reassumitur hoc de Chasaele ad exponendum complementum prophetiae Elisæ.* V. 23 ff. On account of his covenant made with the patriarchs, the Lord did not yet reject Israel from his sight, as they certainly deserved by their obstinate rebellion against him, but now again averted the impending destruction from them by the death of Hazael. For his son and successor Benhadad was three times defeated by Joash, as Elisha had promised, and must have surrendered to the Israelites all the cities conquered by his father under Jehoahaz. The cities which Hazael took from Jehoahaz are not named; even under Jehu he had conquered all Gilead (x. 33), under Jehoahaz probably also a part of the country on this side of the Jordan, as he had carried away almost his whole army (v. 7.) Joash recovered these cities from him, his son Jeroboam Gilead also, comp. xiv. 25.

CHAPTER XIV.

REIGN OF AMAZIAH KING OF JUDAH, VV. 1—22, COMP. 2 CHR. XXV., AND OF JEROBOAM II. OF ISRAEL, VV. 23—29.

Vv. 1—4. Amaziah comes to the sovereignty in the second year of Joash king of Israel. As according to xiii. 10 (comp. our remarks on xiii. 1) Joash of Israel became king towards the end of the thirty-seventh year of Joash of Judah, Amaziah can only have ascended the throne in the second year of Joash of Israel, if his father Joash did not reign thirty-nine full years. Now his reign is certainly, xii. 1, stated at forty years; but these forty years may, according to the above-mentioned principle of our author to give the current years as complete, have amounted only to 38½ or 38¾, in case that Joash attained to the sovereignty a couple of months before Nisan, and his death again occurred a few months after Nisan. There is, therefore, no need of the hypothesis of a co-regency, which is in no way

indicated in the text, though employed by C. a Lap., Seb. Schm., Light (Opp. i. 90) and others.—V. 3 f. Amaziah's reign was theocratic, though it was not like David's, but resembled that of his father Joash, that is, it began well and ended badly. Both kings fell into idolatry in the latter years of their sovereignty. Concerning Joash, see on xii. 3; but Amaziah worshipped the idols of the Edomites, 2 Chr. xxv. 14 ff., he is therefore, 2 Chr. xxv. 2, characterized quite correctly, "he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, only not with a wholly devoted heart;" see my apol. Vers. p. 383.

Vv. 5, 6. After Amaziah had confirmed his kingdom, he avenged the death of his father by the execution of his murderers, but adhered therein to the law of Moses, and did not put to death their children, as no doubt often occurred and was quite customary in antiquity, comp. Hävern. Comm. on Dan. p. 224 and Mich., Mos. R.V. p. 2 ff., because the law (Deut. xxiv. 16) prescribed, "The father shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin.[1] The change of יִמּוּת into יוּמָתוּ (*Keri*) according to Deut. is to be rejected on critical grounds.

V. 7. The brief notice of the conquest of the Edomites in the valley of Salt, and the taking of the town Selah, is completed by 2 Chr. xxv. 6—16, whence we learn, that Amaziah wished to strengthen his own very considerable force for this war by 100,000 mercenary troops from Israel, but at the warning of a prophet sent back the hired Israelites, whereupon they in anger plundered several cities of Judah and slew many men, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 299 and 447.—Under Joram the Edomites, whom David had also defeated in the valley of Salt and then subjugated (2 Sam. viii. 13 f.: 1 Chr. xviii. 10 f.), had revolted from the supremacy of Judah (viii. 20 ff.) Amaziah undertook to reduce them again under his sway, and succeeded so far, that he totally routed their army and took their capital, so that his successor Uzziah was able to incorporate the Edomite seaport Elath

[1] The poor evasion, with which de Wette (Beitr. i. 167) endeavoured to set aside the force of this direct reference to the law of Moses as a proof of the existence of the Pentateuch under Amaziah, Hertz. i. p. q. p. 87 ff., has already estimated at its worth. Comp. also Hävern. i. 2, p. 596.

again into his kingdom (v. 22.) · גֵּי הַמֶּלַח for גֵּיא הַמֶּלַח (2 Chr. xxv. 11) the salt-vale is the Ghor adjacent to the great salt-hill, two and a half hours long, Khashm Usdum خشم اسدم in the south of the Dead Sea, which separated the territories of Judah and Edom (comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 24 f.). הַסֶּלַע ἡ Πέτρα the city Selah or Petra was most probably the capital of the Edomites, as also from the fourth century before Christ of the Nabatheans, and afterwards of *Arabia Petraea*, a great and flourishing commercial town, which is also from the fourth to the sixth century of the Christian era named as the metropolitan church of *Paluestina tertia*. It derives its name *rock* from its situation and mode of architecture. According to Strabo (xvi. 4, 21) it lay "on a place otherwise flat and level, but surrounded by rocks, rising steeply from without, but furnished within with copious fountains for daily use and for watering the gardens" (similarly Plinius in Rob. iii. p. 131), on the east side of the Ghor leading to the Elanitic gulf, about two long days' journey distant from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. Its former glory is attested by the many splendid ruins, which still exist under the name Wady Musa, and were first discovered in modern times by Burckhardt (Reis. ii. p. 703 ff.), afterwards by Irby and Mangles, Laborde, and others, and also visited and described by Rob. (iii. p. 60 ff.)[1] In the taking of Selah the remaining part of the Edomite army, 10,000 men, was probably taken captive and cast down from the top of the rock which was round the city (2 Chr. xxv. 12.)[2] The name יָקְתְאֵל *a Deo subactum, in servi-*

[1] On the identity of the ruins of Wady Musa, called "*Vallis Moysi*" even by the Crusaders, with the ancient Petra, comp. Rob. iii. p. 128 ff., where the historical notices of this city are admirably collected, and p. 760 ff., where the questions concerning the various names given to Petra, and concerning the transference of the name Petra to other places, are discussed with great profoundness. Burckhardt in the p. q. at p. 704 has given a plan of these ruins; that designed by Laborde is still better, which is also adopted in the map of Arabia belonging to Robinson's Palestine.

[2] Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 81) wishes without necessity to correct this statement of Chr. by the assumption of the writing of עֲשֶׂרֶת אֲלָפִים being repeated through neglect; for which there is so much

tutem redactum (comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1244), which Amazian applied to the city, was naturally retained only so long as the city remained in the power of the Jews, that is, till the time of Ahaz (xvi. 6), and therefore does not again occur. Joktheel signifies, moreover, also a city in the tribe of Judah, Jos. xv. 38. The phrase עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה proves, therefore, that the history of Amaziah was written, if not in his time, at least very soon after his death.

Vv. 8—10. After the conquest of the Edomites, Amaziah engaged in a war with Joash of Israel, which had an unfortunate issue for him. The external occasion of it, which is not mentioned in our narrative, was probably given, as the Rabbins supposed, by the hostilities committed against Judah by the dismissed mercenary troops of Israel (2 Chr. xxv. 13); but the proper and deeper ground was pride and insolence, which Amaziah, in consequence of his victory over the Edomites, allowed to steal upon him and carry him so far that he not only, forgetting the Lord his God, to whom alone he owed this victory, worshipped the Edomite idols taken in war as gods, and by threats reduced to silence the prophet who censured this idolatry (2 Chr. xxv. 14 ff.), but also, in the proud confidence of his might, challenged Joash the king of Israel to war. The historian has omitted even the professed external ground of this challenge, but has sufficiently discovered the internal ground by the statement as well of the haughty challenge, "Come, let us look one another in the face," as also of the answer of Joash warning him of his arrogance (vv. 9, 10.)—The phrase הִתְרָאוּ פָנִים *adspexerunt sibi vultus* corresponds to the German expression, to view heads, to measure one with another, that is, to engage in combat with one another. This signification has رَأَى vi. in Arab., comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1247.—Joash admonishes his proud adversary with a fable, as Jotham once similarly instructed his fellow-citizens (Judg. ix. 8 ff.) The fable of the brier (v. 9) is not to be so ex-

the less reason, as according to his own confession (p. 259) this whole section of Chronicles is not taken from our Books of Kings, as he has been pleased to assume with regard to the other parallel sections. To the suspicion thrown on this narrative of Chronicles on the part of Gramberg, Movers p. 259 has moreover replied as it deserved.

plained in detail, that by the brier we should directly understand Amaziah, by the cedar Joash, and by the wild beast the warriors or the war, or suppose, with Dereser, that Amaziah had sought a daughter of Joash in marriage for one of his sons and employed the refusal as a pretext for war; for with reason Seb. Schm. has remarked, *existimo non omnia in applicatione adhibenda*, and thus explained the fable: *rubus s. spina ad cedrum mittens est homo superbia elatus; petitio filiae cedri est res indigna postulatu; conculcatio a bestiis agri scil. per cedrum immissis est ingens calamitas temere adscita.* Correct on the whole; only we must regard the desire of a daughter of the cedar as a wife for his son on the part of the brier more correctly as an ambition going beyond the bounds of his own standing and power, and omit the addition, *per cedrum immissis*, introduced into the parable by Schm. The trampling of the brier by a wild beast, is to teach the fall and ruin, which, unexpectedly, overtake the haughty in the midst of his highflown schemes. V. 10 contains the application of the fable.—נְשָׂאֲךָ לִבֶּךָ *animus te tollit*, that is, thy courage is raised, thou art proudly uplifted, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 915. הִכָּבֵד "be honoured," that is, *habeto tibi hunc honorem, sis eo contentus.* Maur.—"Why wilt thou meddle with misfortune." הִתְגָּרֵה to engage in strife, war, comp. Deut. ii. 5, 9, 19, 24, etc. So also here, where misfortune (רָעָה) is regarded as the foe, with which one is engaged in strife, as Winer (*lex.* p. 195) has rightly observed.

Vv. 11—14. Yet Amaziah in his arrogance regarded this warning as little as the representation of the prophet, that, on account of his revolt from the Lord, God had determined to destroy him (2 Chr. xxv. 16), and according to the Divine foreordination (2 Chr. xxv. 20) engaged in war. But Joash anticipating him, invaded Judah; and at Bethshemesh, (comp. on this city above, p. 46), not only put his army to route, but took himself captive, marched to Jerusalem, broke down a considerable part of the city walls, plundered the treasures of the temple and palace, and returned with hostages to Samaria. V. 13. "And he brake down the wall of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim to the corner gate 400 cubits," that is, about the half of the northern wall. For the gate of Ephraim lay at all events on the

north side of the city, on the way to Ephraim, and is also called the gate of Benjamin, Jer. xxxvii. 13, xxxviii. 7, Zech. xiv. 10, because the way to Ephraim went over the land of Benjamin, comp. Faber. Arch. i. p. 333 f. and Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 375. It is no doubt to be sought in the region of the present Damascus gate, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 377.—V. 14. בְּנֵי הַתַּעֲרֻבוֹת, which the old translators (LXX. τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν συμμίξεων, Syr. ܒܢܝ ܥܪܒܐ *filii commixtionis i. e. gens promiscua*, Arab. بَنِي عَرَبٍ, and Chald. בְּנֵי רַבְרְבַיָּא *filii Magnatum*) did not rightly understand, means *obsides*, the hostages (see Ges. *thes.* ii. 1064), namely, those who must have been given to Joash for the liberation of Amaziah. This liberation of the king, indeed, is not expressly mentioned, but it necessarily follows from this that Joash did not take him with him to Samaria, but Amaziah remained king in Jerusalem, and outlived Joash about fifteen years (v. 17.)

Vv. 15—22. In vv. 15 and 16, the author of our books repeats the end of the reign of Joash with the standing formula from xiii. 12 f., *ut ostendat, Amatsiam ei supervixisse laudetque divinam misericordiam, quae tamen Amatsiam non plane perdere voluerit, abrepto ex hac vita Joaso.* Seb. Schm.—V. 17, comp. 2 Chr. xxv. 25.—V. 19. Several ancient expositors discover the cause of the conspiracy against Amaziah in the unfortunate issue of his war with Joash. But this hypothesis would only have gained probability if the conspiracy had broken out soon after the departure of Joash. Some indeed believed this, and appealed to 2 Chr. xxv. 27, where it is said, "after the time that Amaziah turned away from the Lord, they made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem," (comp Mich. *annot. uber. ad h. l.* and Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. 408), but it only follows from this that the conspiracy had its internal ground in the revolt of Amaziah from the Lord, the evil consequences of which appeared in the unfortunate war with Joash, but not that it broke out at that time, that Amaziah was forthwith removed and exiled to Lachish, and that the government in Jerusalem was committed to his son. For it is at once very improbable in itself, that Amaziah being removed from the throne, lived fifteen years in peace at Lachish, and then first

made an attempt to recover the sovereignty, in which he was slain; and then, if this had actually taken place, it should have been recorded of Uzziah, as well as in xv. 5 of Jotham, that he governed the kingdom during the time of his father's deposition. But neither in v. 22 nor in xv. 8 is the least intimation of this found. We must therefore assume that the conspiracy broke out first towards the end of the twenty-nine years' reign of Amaziah, that Amaziah indeed escaped to Lachish, but was immediately put to death by the conspirators sent thither after him, whereupon they brought his body to Jerusalem, and there buried it, while his son Uzziah was made king by the people in his stead.—לָכִישׁ Lachish, a Canaanitish royal city (Jos. x. 3—31, xii. 11) in the lowlands of Judah (Jos. xv. 39), fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chr. xi. 9), afterwards taken by Sennacherib (2 Ki. xviii. 14—17; 2 Chr. xxxii. 9), lay, according to Eusebius, seven Roman miles south of Eleutheropolis (comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 207), and is irrecoverably lost, as the ruins Um Lakis (ام لاكس) are not identical with the old Lachish, see Rob. Pal. ii. p. 653 f. "They brought him עַל־הַסּוּסִים on the horses," that is, on a chariot drawn by the king's horses, to Jerusalem.—V. 21. עֲזַרְיָה or עֲזַרְיָהוּ Azariah (v. 21, xv. 1, 6, 8, 17, 23, 27,) is called in v. 13, 30, 32; 2 Chr. xxvi. 1, 3, 11 etc.; Is. i. 1, vi. 1; Am. i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5 עֻזִּיָּהוּ or עֻזִּיָּה Uzziah. Some expositors regard עזריה as an error of the pen arising out of עזיה, which however, on account of the frequency of the name, is destitute of probability. We must rather assume that the king actually had both names, which are closely related in signification; עֻזִּיָּה means *potentia Jovae*, עזריה *quem Jova adjuvit*; as the Oriental names are so changeable. Comp. on 1 Ki. xv. 2. —V. 22. Immediately after his father's death Uzziah (Azariah) fortified the Edomite seaport Elath or Eloth (see on 1 Ki. ix. 26) and restored it to Judah; comp. the remarks on v. 7. From the words, "after that the king slept with his fathers," we cannot with Jarchi, Abarb. (comp. Meyer *annot. ad Sed. Ol.* p. 950) and Seb. Schm. infer, that Uzziah had attained to the sovereignty before the death of Amaziah; the words merely state that Uzziah completed the reduction of the Edomites, com-

menced by his father immediately after his death by the conquest of Elath.

Vv. 23—29. Reign of Jeroboam II. of Israel. Jeroboam adhered to the antitheocratical image worship of his father (v. 24), but raised his kingdom to great political power, inasmuch as he restored its original boundaries, and continuing the conquests of his father, recovered all the conquered territory from the Syrians, v. 25, comp. with xiii. 25. מְלֹבוֹא חֲמָת was the northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah under Solomon, comp. 1 Ki. viii. 65. יַם הָעֲרָבָה "sea of the plain" is the Salt or Dead Sea. This line of boundary is taken from Deut. iii. 17, iv. 49, which the prophet Jonah follows in his announcements, comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii., p. 140.[1] Jonah the son of Amittai is the same prophet, the history of whose predictions concerning Nineveh are preserved for us in the book of Jonah; comp. de Wette, Einl. p. 330), and Hävern. Einl. ii. 2, p. 324 f. גַּת הַחֵפֶר Gath-hepher belonging to the tribe of Zebulon (Jos. xix. 13), and according to Hieron., situated two Roman miles from Sepphoris towards Tiberias (see v. Raum. p. 125) is according to modern monastic tradition preserved in the village el Meshchad (المشهد), where one of the many Moslemite graves of the Neby Yunas is shown (Rob. Pal. iii. p. 449.)—Vv. 26 and 27 assign the reasons why the Lord granted to the antitheocratically disposed Jeroboam so great power for the restoration of the old boundaries of the land formerly determined by Moses. This took place, because the Lord saw the heavy oppression and helpless condition of Israel, and had not yet pronounced the decree for the extirpation of the kingdom of the ten tribes, and thus had not yet annulled his covenant with the apostate people (xiii. 23.) עֳנִי מֹרֶה most explain after the old versions, "bitter affliction." Coccei., J. H. Mich., and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 818), however, adhere to the usual meaning of

[1] By this reference to the quoted passages of the Pentateuch the inference drawn by Credner (in Ullm. u. Umbr.'s theol. Stud. 1833, p. 3, p. 785) and Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 181 f.) from our verse, namely, that Jeroboam subjugated again the territory of the Moabites, is proved to be unfounded: for from this it is evident, that he merely incorporated again with his kingdom the Israelitish territory as far as the Arnon, the river of the plain (Am. vi. 14.)

מרה *contumax, pervicax*, as much as to say, *insanabilis*. But it must be evident, that the former meaning suits better, on which account we assume, that מרד here takes its signification from מרר, for which the language presents so many analogies: though מרר Ex. xxiii. 21 occurs also in the signification of מרה; for Cler. has justly remarked, מָרָה (*faem.* of מר) *amarus est doloris et moeroris frequentissimum epitheton, cum* מֹרֶה *dolor nusquam dicatur.* וְאַפֵס עָצוּר וגו׳ "and all is gone, bond and free." de Wette. On this phrase borrowed from the Pentateuch see on 1 Ki. xiv. 10. Israel was sunk down to the helpless misery predicted by Moses, Deut. xxxii. 16; therefore the Lord helped them, as His servant Moses had then promised them, that they might perceive that their idols could afford no deliverance, and might acknowledge the Lord alone as their God, Deut. xxxii. 37—42. —The words, v. 28, וַאֲשֶׁר הֵשִׁיב וגו׳ "and how he recovered Damascus and Hamath of Judah to Israel," have given much trouble to the old expositors, inasmuch as they took לִיהוּדָה for a dative and (as de Wette still does) rendered, "how he brought Damascus and Hamath to Judah through Israel," whereby no tolerable sense is elicited, as we shall be convinced by the attempted explanations collected by Seb. Schm.[1] ליהודה is a periphrasis for the genitive, and was correctly explained by Cler. *quæ olim Judæ fuerant.* It might still be a question, whether it is to be referred merely to חֲמַת, "the Jewish Hamath" (Mich.) or also to דַּמֶּשֶׂק (Cler. and others.) The former is obviously the correct supposition. Jeroboam might certainly recover Damascus, but not the city Hamath (*Ἐπιφάνεια* on the Orontes) to Israel, because the latter never belonged to the kingdom of Israel, as was proved above p. 134. But David had conquered Damascus and made Damascene Syria tributary to him (2 Sam. viii. 5 f.; 1 Chr. xviii. 4 ff.) In Solomon's time indeed Rezon had assumed to be king of Damascus (1 Ki. xi. 23 ff.); yet it is a question, whether he attained to complete inde-

[1] Movers also (Krit. Unters. p. 125) has quite misunderstood our passage, when he after Hitzig (d. proph. Jonas Or. 1831 p. 23 and Comm. on Is. p. 184) explains it thus, that Jeroboam conquered Hamath itself and transferred it with Damascus to Judah, for which, wonderful to tell, he quotes Am. v. 27, "I will carry you away beyond Damascus."

pendence, as it is only said of him in the passage quoted, that he was hostile to Solomon during his whole reign, abhorred Israel and made himself king over Aram, but it is not mentioned that this province was lost to Israel under Solomon. The meaning of our words accordingly is, how Jeroboam restored Damascus and that part of Hamath, which under Solomon was included in the kingdom of Judah, to Israel, which in its origin received this northern part of the kingdom, whereby he restored the original boundaries of the kingdom in the north (v. 25)[1]—V. 29. As Jeroboam came to the sovereignty in the fifteenth year of Amaziah and reigned forty-one years, his death fell in the twenty-sixth year of Uzziah. If, therefore, his son became king in the thirty-eighth year of Uzziah (xv. 8), he cannot have ascended the throne immediately after the death of his father. See on xv. 8.

[1] Though according to 2 Chr. viii. 4 Solomon established magazine cities in Hamath, yet we are not to infer with Winer (R.W. i. p. 537) from this, that he possessed the city Hamath itself; still less does it lie "expressly" in these words. Unfounded also is Winer's farther remark i. p. q., that from the word הֵשִׁיב in our passage an earlier possession of the Israelites does not necessarily follow. For although the meaning of *again* does not lie immediately in שׁוּב, yet הֵשִׁיב can have here as well as in v. 25 no other meaning than, to bring back, restore. The difficulties, lastly, which Winer raised against viewing לִיהוּדָה as a genitive, are quite unimportant. For although הֵשִׁיב in this signification is often construed with *dat. pers.* or *cum* לְ, yet the construction with בְּ is by no means repugnant to the spirit of the language, and must be assumed here for this reason, that every other view, even that proposed by Winer "to Judah in Israel (that is, to the theocratic people, but in Israel)," is unnatural, since neither can Judah stand at once for the theocratic people, nor can the language be in any sense applied to a Judah in Israel.

CHAPTER XV.

REIGN OF AZARIAH OR UZZIAH KING OF JUDAH, VV. 1—7, AND OF SEVERAL KINGS OF ISRAEL, VV. 8—38.

Vv. 1—7. Comp. 2 Chr. xxvi. "In the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam . . . Azariah became king . . ." This chronological date is inconsistent with xiv. 2, 16, 17, 23. If Amaziah ascended the throne in the fifteenth year of Joash of Israel, and in his twenty-nine years' reign outlived Joash about fifteen years (xiv. 2—17), if, moreover, Jeroboam succeeded his father Joash in the fifteenth year of Amaziah (xiv. 23), and therefore Amaziah died in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam, Uzziah or Azariah can only have become king in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam, as there is not the slightest ground for the assumption of an *interregnum* of twelve years, much rather according to xiv. 21 was Azariah made king immediately after the death of his father.[1] To save the correctness of the statement, "in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam," many wished to reckon not from the actual commencement of Jeroboam's reign, but from the time when his father Joash declared him king (Ussher *annal. ad. a.m.* 3168, Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 410, Tiele, Chron. p. 70, and many others.) By this the chronology is not disturbed, provided we compute, as all the supporters of this opinion do, the years of Jeroboam's reign not from his co-regency but from his sole sovereignty; but this opinion has no positive ground whatever, and deviates from the analogy of the other synchronistic dates, which always refer to the proper reign of the kings. We shall, therefore, be compelled with L. Capell., Grot.,

[1] The ancients have rightly rejected the hypothesis of an interregnum applied here also by Mich., Walther (*harm. bibl.* p. 268), Petav. and others, because, not to speak of its contradicting the text, thereby the interregnum introduced after the death of Jeroboam in Israel must have been prolonged to twenty-two or twenty-three years. Comp. *des. Vign. chron.* i. p. 356 f., Budd. hist. eccl. ii. p. 409, Dahl, Amos new transl. p. 6, and Maur. in the *Commentatt. theol.* edited by Rosenm. and himself, ii. 1, p. 284 f.

des Vign. Chron. i. p. 355 f. and others to regard the number twenty-seven as an error of transcription originating in the change of טז into כז and alter it into fifteen.[1]—V. 3 ff. The author of our books limits himself to this, to characterize the spirit of the reign of Uzziah by the formula customary with him, without specifying merely one particular act of his long and, as appears from the parallel passage in 2 Chr. xxvi., eventful reign, probably because it exercised no essential or permanent influence on the development of the theocracy (comp. ch. xvi.) As Amaziah was unfaithful to the Lord in the last years of his reign (see on xiv. 3), so Uzziah did that which was right in the eyes of God only so long as Zechariah, who was experienced in the visions of God, lived, and during this time carried on successful wars against the Philistines and Arabians, fortified the walls of Jerusalem with strong towers, built watch towers in the wilderness, and digged cisterns for the protection and the supply of his large flocks, promoted the culture of the field and the vineyard, and collected a numerous and well appointed army (2 Chr. xxvi. 5—15.) But the great power to which he thereby attained made him arrogant, and estranged his heart from the law of the Lord, so that he, like the heathen kings, wished to assume to be sovereign pontiff of his kingdom, and intruding into the sacred functions belonging solely to the Levitical priests according to the law of Moses, to offer incense in the temple, for which he was punished on the spot with the leprosy (v. 5, and 2 Chr. xxvi. 16 ff.) With respect to these accounts peculiar to Chronicles, which Gramberg's injudicious criticism declared to be mere inventions, even Winer (R.W. ii. p. 754) remarks: "they harmonize very well with the rigorous and warlike character of the reign of this sovereign, Is. xiv. 29." They are also the less to be questioned,

[1] Another expedient, namely, to understand the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam with some Rabb. not of the beginning of his reign, but of the time that Jeroboam had still to reign, or even with other Rabb. and Tremellius of the year in which Uzziah was smitten with the leprosy (see Meyer *ad. Sed. Ol.* p. 950 ff.), is so unnatural, that it is scarcely worthy of mention. The unnatural character of the latter assumption, in which v. 1 is joined with v. 5 into one sentence, and v. 2—4 is taken parenthetically, has been already exposed by *des Vign. l.c.* p. 358 ff.

as they almost all receive confirmation from other sources,[1] and

[1] Comp. my apol. Vers. p. 418 ff. What Movers in his Krit. Unters. p. 125 f., has brought together for the vindication of the peculiar accounts of Chronicles stands very much in need of a critical sifting.—The subjugation of the Philistines is presupposed in Is. xiv. 28 (comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 495) and partly also by Amos vi. 2, comp. with xi. 6—8. To the great buildings of Uzziah Hosea viii. 14 alludes: "Judah hath multiplied fenced cities;" and Isaiah (ii. 7), in a prediction embracing the times of Uzziah and Jotham, depicts the land as "full of silver and gold, and no end of its treasures, full of horses, and no end of its chariots," whereby the efforts of Uzziah, mentioned in Chronicles, to increase the prosperity of his kingdom and augment his military force are abundantly confirmed. It is more difficult to support the statement (Chr. v. 10), that the Ammonites paid him tribute, though as little can its historical truth underlie any reasonable doubt. As the territory of the Ammonites was separated by Gilead from the kingdom of Judah, there arises a question not easy to be answered, in what way Uzziah may have made them tributary to him. Credner (i. p. q. p. 787 f.) thinks that Uzziah made this nation tributary during the distraction that occurred after the death of Jeroboam II. in the kingdom of Israel, by political negotiation without warlike interference, inasmuch as they, being afraid of his superior power, voluntarily submitted themselves to the protection of the kingdom of Judah, but because this was done from regard to the personal character of Uzziah, they had attempted to revolt again under Jotham, so that he was obliged to enforce the payment of tribute by war (2 Chr. xxvii. 5.) But this hypothesis is too destitute of probability to command our assent, especially if we reflect, that the Moabites, dwelling between Judah and the Ammonites, were not subdued, but as Credner thinks, had been able by all manner of excuses and evasions, first to delay and then actually to withhold submission. But were the Ammonites who lived farther from Judah so altogether deficient in excuses and evasions? Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 130 f.) accounts for the submission of the Ammonites in this way, that Uzziah and Jotham had possessed a part of the territory of Gilead "probably ceded by Jeroboam to Uzziah in consequence of an amicable arrangement," through which the way was open to them to make war on the Ammonites. But of such a friendly cession of a part of Gilead to Judah history knows nothing. It no more follows from the passages quoted by Movers, 2 Ki. xiv. 28; Mic. vii. 14, than from the numbering of the Gadites under Jotham mentioned 1 Chr. v. 17, or from the fact that Uzziah also possessed flocks, בַּמִּישׁוֹר (2 Chr. xxvi. 10.) For even though מִישׁוֹר often denotes the great plain in the territory of Reuben (for example Deut. iii. 10, iv. 43, etc.), yet this word is also used of other plains, inasmuch as Jer. xxi. 13, Jerusalem is designated as צוּר הַמִּישׁוֹר, and therefore Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 643) quite correctly understands it in 2 Chr. xxvi. 10, *de planitie tribus Judae.* This hypothesis, therefore, is destitute of any tenable ground. Uzziah probably reduced the Ammonites to tribute

gain probability from the long duration of this reign. The time when Uzziah was smitten with leprosy is not mentioned, indeed, either here or in Chronicles, but this Divine punishment, which unfitted him for reigning, must have befallen him only in the last ten years of his fifty-two years' reign, because his son, who was only twenty-five years old at the death of his father (v. 33, and 2 Chr. xxvii. 1), immediately undertook the administration of the kingdom, and therefore must then have been at least fifteen years of age. The leprosy of the king is likewise described in our narrative as a Divine judgment, "Jehovah smote (וַיִּגַּע) the king and he became a leper." This expression presupposes guilt, and therefore an act of the kind which is recorded in Chronicles, while the addition to the description of his conduct, "as his father Amaziah," warrants, indeed necessitates the assumption, that he did not do that which was right in the eyes of the Lord with undeviating consistency. So much the less reason is there to pronounce with de Wette and Win. i. p. q. the historical occasion mentioned in Chronicles for the infliction of this Divine judgment to be an invention of the writer, conceived in a Levitical spirit; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 316 f. On account of the

after the taking of Elath (xiv. 22), from which he might undertake an expedition against them without touching on the territory of the Moabites, and probably did undertake it because they had given aid to the Edomites against Judah, or from some other cause to us unknown. If their subjugation had taken place at the time of the anarchy succeeding the death of Jeroboam, it would also be conceivable that by an attack upon Gilead they had even threatened the kingdom of Judah, whereby Uzziah was induced to make war upon them in the most direct way through the territory of Reuben. The prophet Amos, who prophesied under Uzziah and Jeroboam, is acquainted with incursions of the Ammonites into Gilead, in which they perpetrated the greatest atrocities, for which he denounces upon them the Divine judgment, Am. i. 13 f. But this conjecture has small probability. The war between them and Jotham (2 Chr. xxvii. 5) also requires another approach to them for the Jews than through Gilead, as Jotham was not on so friendly terms with Pekah that he could have marched through his territory. Their revolt after Uzziah's death, in consequence of which Jotham commenced hostilities against them, is placed by Movers p. 133 in the fourth year of Jotham, and connected with the first invasion of Tiglath Pileser and the consequent deportation of the Gileadites; but on purely false presumptions and conclusions, as will be shown on xvi. 7 f. The time of the revolt is unknown, as it cannot be inferred from 2 Chr. xxvii. 5.

leprosy Uzziah was obliged to commit the government to his son, and submitting to the strictness of the Mosaic law (comp. on vii. 3) to live in a separate house. בֵּית הַחָפְשִׁית is explained by Win. (*lex s. v.*) and Ges. (*thes.* i. 509) after Ikèn (*diss. phil. theol.* ii. 184) and Mich. (*suppl.* p. 884), *nosocomium*, lazaretto. Altogether arbitrary and erroneous; for חָפַשׁ does not mean *debilis, infirmus fuit*, nor חָפְשִׁי *infirmus, aegrotus;* the Arab. خفش is not connected with it, because ش, as is well known, corresponds, not with שׁ, but with שׂ. חָפְשִׁי means only *liber* or *manumissus*, even in Ps. lxxxviii. 6, and בית החפשית Aquila has rightly explained by *οἶκος ἐλευθερίας*, house of liberation, so called, not *quia in ea segregati sunt ab hominibus et quasi liberi a societate eorum* (Kimchi), but as "the place where those dwelt, whom the Lord had manumitted, who no longer belonged to his servants;" comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 592.—עַל־הַבַּיִת *erat praefectus regiae*, was governor of the royal palace, judging the people of the land, that is, undertook the management of the palace and the royal office of judge, that is, the administration of the kingdom.—V. 7. The place where Uzziah was buried is called in 2 Chr. xxvi. 33, the field of burial of the kings. This is only a more exact definition of the general עִיר דָּוִד, but not a difference, as Winer (R.W. ii. p. 754) asserts, as the burial-field of the kings was in the city of David, and Uzziah was buried in the royal burial-field indeed, but not in the royal vault on account of his leprosy.

Vv. 8—12. *Reign of Zechariah of Israel.* "In the thirty-eighth year of Uzziah king of Judah Jeroboam's son, Zechariah, became king over Israel." As according to our remarks on xiv. 29 Jeroboam died on the twenty-sixth year of Uzziah, there is an *interregnum* of ten or twelve years between the death of Jeroboam and the beginning of the reign of his son Zechariah, as almost all chronologists admit, inasmuch as, without this assumption, the chronological synchronism would be completely destroyed; but the correctness of our author's statement is placed beyond a doubt by the commencements of the following reigns (vv. 13, 17, 23, 27), and all attempts to remove the difference otherwise prove themselves to be untenable at the first glance.

Comp. *Usseri Annal.* p. 45, Offerhaus, *spicil.* p. 117 f., *des Vignoles chron.* i. p. 262 f., *Budd. hist.* ii. p. 415, Win. R.W. i. p. 730 and ii. p. 822, Tiele, Chronol. p. 71, Maurer in the *commentatt. theol.* edited by himself and Rosenm. it. 1 p. 286 f.—V. 9 ff. Zechariah also continued in the sins of his fathers, in the worship of the calves, and the word of the Lord uttered (x. 30) concerning Jehu was therefore fulfilled in him. In consequence of a conspiracy he was put to death, and the throne taken from the house of Jehu. נֶגֶד־עַם before the people, that is, openly before the eyes of all. As Israel was not led by the tokens of the Lord's mercy experienced under Joash, and especially under Jeroboam, any more than by the previous heavy judgments and the earnest appeals and warnings of the prophets Hosea and Amos, to repent and return to the Lord his God and King, the judgment of rejection must at last break in upon a people so shamefully scorning the grace, long-suffering, and covenant faithfulness of God. We see the kingdom, therefore, after the death of Jeroboam, hastening with rapid strides to its fall. In the sixty-two years from the death of Jeroboam to the conquest of Samaria by Shalmaneser, two anarchies, making up twenty years, prevailed, and six kings followed one another, of whom only one, Menahem, died a natural death, so that his son succeeded him on the throne; the remaining five were dethroned and murdered by rebels, so that, according to the just remark of Witsius, with the murder of Zechariah not only the sentence of Hosea (i. 4), "I will visit the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu,"[1] but also the sentence forming a parallel with it, "and will cause to cease

[1] "The blood of Jezreel," or the blood shed in Jezreel, is the extirpation of the dynasty of Ahab and the Baal worshippers. So far as Jehu acted therein by command of God, this act was imputed to him as meritorious (comp. on x. 30), but so far as he followed his own ambition and sin more than the command of God, he was involved in guilt. The prophet Hosea estimates the act according to its subjective motives, and pronounces it a deed of blood, whereas in our historical narrative, above x. 30, only the objective act as such is regarded. It is quite perverse, therefore, in Hitzig, Comm. on Hos., to explain the words of the prophet in the way, that the prophet blames Jehu not for the death of Joram and Jezebel, but for the murder of Ahaziah and his brothers, as well as the bloodshed, 2 Ki. x. 11. As if the prophets had determined their predictions by such petty partialities! The right view of the passage Hitzig might have discovered in Witsius *l.c.*

the kingdom of the house of Israel," was carried into effect, inasmuch as with Zechariah the kingdom properly ceased in Israel. *Nam successores Zachariae non tam reges fuerunt, quam fures, latrones ac tyranni, augusto Regum nomine indigni, qui tyrannidem male partam neque melius habitam fœde amiserunt. Witsius Δεκαφυλ.* p. 320.

Vv. 13—16. Zechariah's murderer, Shallum, held the throne only one month (יָרַח יָמִים comp. Deut. xxi. 13, and as to this use of יָמִים Ges. *thes.* ii. 585), as he was assailed in war by Menahem of Tirzah, and slain by him at Samaria. וַיַּעַל (v. 14) here denotes, as *term. milit. techn.* the advance of the foe or hostile army. Menahem must therefore have been general or commander of the forces, as Josephus (Antiq. ix. 11, 1) expressly says. As to the situation of Tirzah see on 1 Ki. xv. 21.—V. 16. Setting out from Tirzah Menahem smote תִּפְסַח also, the city *Thapsacus* with all its environs, because it did not open its gates to him, that is, he took it by storm, and treated the vanquished with such barbarous vengeance that he did not spare the child in the mother's womb; comp. viii. 12.—תִּפְסַח is no other than Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the border city of the kingdom of Israel under Solomon (1 Ki. v. 4; see above p. 57), which, with the restoration of the old limits of the kingdom by Jeroboam II. (xiv. 25, 28) had again come to the kingdom of Israel, as J. D. Mich. has justly remarked. On the contrary most expositors, and following them v. Raum. Pal. p. 164 regard our תפסח as a city of Palestine in the neighbourhood of Tirzah. But this assumption is destitute of all ground, and has only arisen from this, that explaining מִתִּרְצָה "from Tirzah onward," they understood our author, as if Menahem had wasted the whole country from Tirzah to Tiphsah. But even Maurer, the most decided advocate of this opinion concerning Tiphsah, rejects this view, and with Schultz and de Wette refers מתרצה to the verb in the beginning of the verse: "he smote setting out from Tirzah" (*excursione ex oppido Tirzae facta*), but thinks, *Menahem non is fuit qui in tam latum terrarum spatium, quale Tirzae, oppido Ephr. et Tapsaco interjectum est, tamque magnam et locupletem urbem, victricia arma proferret.* But why Menahem was not the man, it might be difficult to prove. What Maurer says on this,

namely that Menahem was *civitatis a capite revulsae omnique scelere inde ab initiis laceratae regulus*, would, if it had argumentative force at all, prove too much, namely that Jeroboam II. also was not in a position to reconquer the ancient boundaries of his kingdom in the north. But where have we the standard by which to estimate the valour and strength of the army of Israel led by Menahem, in order to be able to assert with confidence that he was not able to take the city Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the size and strength of which at that time are to us completely unknown? While, then, the reasons adduced for a Tiphsah in the neighbourhood of Tirzah are unfounded, the name תִּפְסַח *trajectus* is also opposed to this opinion, which is scarcely explicable, even if conceivable, of a town not far from Tirzah.

Vv. 17—22. Menahem's ten years' reign resembles that of his antitheocratic predecessors. During his reign the Assyrians for the first time marched against Israel under king Pul; but Menahem gave Pul 1000 talents of silver (about £342,200), "that his hands might be with him, to confirm the kingdom in his hand" (v. 19.) These words are so understood by Ephr. Syr., C. a Lap., Calm., Dereser, and others, with reference to Hos. v. 13, as if Menahem had summoned Pul to his aid, in order to establish his dominion by his assistance. But this view is not necessarily demanded by the words of Hosea, "Ephraim goes to the Assyrian," namely to seek aid, and is in contradiction with the words of our verse, "Pul came against the land." In conformity with these words we must understand the matter thus: Pul of his own motion, perhaps induced thereto by the expedition of Menahem against Thapsacus, advanced against the kingdom of Israel; then Menahem sent him 1000 talents, in order not only to divert him from his plans of conquest, but at the same time to purchase his friendship and aid for the establishment of his own precarious sovereignty, so that Menahem did not properly invite the Assyrians into the land, but only changed the enemy, when advancing against the country, by this tribute into a confederate for the security of his usurped dominion; which the prophet Hosea, who was less concerned about the historical fact than the disposition betrayed therein, might very well censure as a going of Ephraim to the Assyrians (besides v. 13 comp. also vii. 11, viii.

9) and a covenant-making with Asshur (xii. 2.) Pul (פּוּל) is the first Assyrian king, whom the Old Testament mentions after Nimrod, who extended his dominion over Asshur and built Nineveh (Gen. x. 9 ff.) With him the conquests of the Assyrians in hither Asia begin, and are continued by his successors Tiglath Pileser (v. 29, xvi. 9, and 1 Chr. v. 26), Shalmaneser (xvii. 5 ff., xviii. 9 ff.), and Sennacherib (xviii. 13 ff.), until the latter, under Hezekiah, suffered the total extermination of his army, and on his return to Nineveh was put to death by his sons, on which his son Esarhaddon succeeded him.[1] According to the biblical accounts, the Assyrian empire in the time of Pul was at the height of its power, with which also agree the fragments from the history of this empire, which are handed down to us in the Chronicon of Eusebius from Berosus, Alexander Polyhistor, and Abydenus. According to the citations of Polyhistor from Berosus, after Semiramis forty-five Assyrian kings reigned altogether 526 years. They were followed by Pul, who invaded Judaea; after-

[1] In modern times Sargon also (Is. xx. 1) is usually named as an Assyrian king, who according to Paul., Rosenm., Gesen., Hitzig on Is. xx. and others, must have reigned only a short time between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, whereas Vitringa and Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 128 f.) hold Sargon to be the same as Shalmaneser, but Kalinsky, Marsham, and J. D. Mich., as Esarhaddon, and the Rabbins, Hieron., and Schroeer (*imper. Babyl. et Nini* p. 152) as Sennacherib. Of all these opinions the last only is probable. He cannot have reigned between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, because there is no interval between the two, as Sennacherib appeared in Judea in the year 714 (xviii. 13), but Shalmaneser can scarcely have been dead before the year 716 or 715, as, according to a notice of Menander of Ephesus in Josephus (Ant. ix. 14, 2), after the conquest of Samaria in the year 722 he made war on the Phœnicians, and then besieged Tyre for five years. Josephus, indeed, does not expressly say that this war took place after the dissolution of the kingdom of the ten tribes, but this we must conclude from the fact that Hoshea king of Israel would scarcely have ventured to revolt from the Assyrians, as long as the Assyrian army was in Phœnicia. To this it is to be added, that according to Tob. i. 18 Shalmaneser was succeeded on the throne by his son Sennacherib. But the identifying of Sargon with Shalmaneser is met by the objection, that Shalmaneser scarcely extended his conquests to Philistæa. On the contrary, it speaks for his identity with Sennacherib at least, that Tartan, Sargon's general (Is. xxi. 1) appeared under Sennacherib before Jerusalem, xviii. 17.

wards, in the time of Hezekiah, Senecheribus (Sennacherib) reigned eighteen years, Asordanes eight, Sammughes twenty-one, whose brother Sardanapalus twenty-one, Nabopolassar twenty, and Nabucodrossor (Nebuchadnezzar) forty-three (*Chron. Armen.* b. i. ch. 4 and 5, p. 18 ff. *edit. Mediol.*) Abydenus (*ibid.* p. 25) names the following Assyrian sovereigns, Sennacherib, Nergilus (or Adrameles), Axerdis, Sardanapalus, Saracus, under whom his general Busalosor (Nabopolassar) assumed the sovereignty of Babylonia, attacked Ninus, and, after Saracus had burned himself with his palace, held the dominion over the Chaldaeans and Babylonians. Comp. Wilh. Hupfeld, *exercitt. Herodot. spec.* i. p. 9—11. By these fragments our biblical accounts of the Assyrian empire are sufficiently confirmed, inasmuch as, notwithstanding their deviations in several names, so much appears certain, that it was at that time still undiminished in power, and only ceased to exist a long time after Esarhaddon, with the conquest of Nineveh by Nabopolassar.[1]

[1] By this means are harmonized the scattered notices, which Herodotus furnishes concerning the expedition of Sennacherib against Egypt (ii. 141), and the taking of Nineveh by Cyaxares the Mede (i. 106) after the 520 years' duration of the Assyrian dominion over Upper Asia (i. 95.) For even if Herodotus does not expressly mention the participation of the Babylonians in the conquest of Nineveh, yet it may be inferred from several of his intimations (comp. Hupf. i. p. q. p. 7 and 21), while again the notices of Polyhistor and Abyd. concerning the marriage of the daughter of the Median prince Asdahages with Nabucodrossor (*Euseb. chron. Arm.* p. 21 and 25) point to a connexion of the Babylonians with the Medes in the destruction of the Assyrian monarchy, so that Josephus (Ant. x. 5, 1) is fully justified in saying, that the Medes and Babylonians destroyed the Assyrian empire. But the fall of this empire, with the conquest of Nineveh (Herod. i. 106), cannot have occurred so late as 606 B.C., about a year and a half before the death of Nabopolassar, as Hupf. (i. p. q. p. 7 f.), led astray by the misunderstood passage, 2 Ki. xxiii. 29, assumes, in contradiction to Joseph. (Ant. x. 5, 1), but must have taken place before the war carried on by Cyaxares with the Lydians 610 B.C. (Herod. i. 74), and indeed in the beginning of the twenty years' reign of Nabopolassar, that is, in 625 or 624, comp. Kalkar in Pelt's theolog. Mitarb. part 2, p. 76 f.—On the contrary, according to the citations from Ctesias in Diod. Sic. (ii. 23—28), Nineveh, after a three years' siege by Arbaces the Mede, and Belesys the Babylonian, was destroyed under Sardanapalus, and the dominion of the Assyrians, after a duration of 1300 years, transferred to the

V. 20. וַיֹּצֵא *exegit tributum*, construed with עַל *tributum imposuit*, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 616. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל are not warriors or military heroes; for least of all from the warriors could Menahem

Medes, while Belesys retained the satrapy of Babylonia, and began to reign in his own name as over his own kingdom. This event is usually placed about 880 B.C. (see Hupf. *l. c.* p. 5), while others place it about 260 years before Cyrus, and make Sardanapalus, according to a notice of Euseb., contemporary with Jeroboam II., who died 783 B.C., see Winer R.W. i. p. 119 f. But if the dominion of the Assyrians ceased in the interval between 880 and 800, and in its place a Median monarchy with an independent Babylonian kingdom succeeded, the Assyrians cannot possibly have appeared under Menahem 771—760, and later still in hither Asia as a conquering power. If we chose even to modify with H. Leo (Lehrb. d. Universalgesch. i. p. 118) the hypothesis of a new Assyrian monarchy after the fall of the old under Sardanapalus, which has been devised to reconcile Ctesias with the accounts of the Bible, in such a manner, that the destruction of the old would be nothing more than the founding of a properly independent Median monarchy in the Medo-Persian high lands and in the low land of the Jihun (or Bactria), while the Assyrian monarchy continued under its own kings perhaps of the race of Belesys: it would still, apart from the consideration that it completely alters the accounts of Ctesias in Diodor. Sic., be inconsistent with the biblical accounts, inasmuch as, according to these, if not Pul, at all events Tiglath Pileser and Shalmaneser must have possessed Media, because they transplanted the captive Israelites to Assyria and Media (1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Ki. xv. 29, xvii. 6, xviii. 11.) If we reflect besides, that the assumption of a second Assyrian monarchy is destitute of all historical evidence, that none of the old writers makes the least mention of a twofold destruction of Nineveh or of a restoration of this city after its destruction under Sardanapalus, but, according to the Bible accounts, Nineveh was still unimpaired in the time of the prophet Jonah under Jeroboam II., about 800 B.C., and even much later in the times of the prophet Zephaniah living under Josiah (reigning 642—611), though, according to Zeph. ii. 13, it was soon to be destroyed, that, finally, the statements of two Sardanapali, in the Scholiast to Aristophanes Nub. v. 1022, as little deserve the name of historical testimony as the notice of Syncellus p. 205 of a second Ninus as successor of Sardanapalus (comp. Hupf. *l.c.* p. 29 and 38): we must reject this hypothesis as not merely unsatisfactory, but destitute of all historical ground, and may, if we do not wish to accuse Ctesias of intentional falsification of history, merely assent to the view of Hupfeld (*l.c.* p. 34 ff.), that Ctesias took the sovereigns found registered in the Median annals from Arbaces to Astyages for independent kings of Media, and, thereby led astray, not only placed Sardanapalus with the fall of the Assyrian empire that took place under him about 250 or 260 years too early, but also transferred to Arbaces that which was accomplished only by Dejoces and

levy such a tax,[1] but, men of wealth, *pollentes opibus* (Syr., Vulg., Luth., Vatabl., Grot., Cler., and others, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 262), or more correctly still, men of respectability and influence, inasmuch as this meaning alone, not the special notion of wealth, can be educed from Ruth ii. 1, and 1 Sam. ix. 2.—The "fifty shekels from each" depends on וַיִּצְא, not on לָתֵת. By this tribute Pul was induced to return to his own land, but, according to 1 Chr. v. 26, carried away with him the inhabitants of Gilead.

Vv. 23—26. *Pekahiah* succeeded his father in the government "in the fiftieth year of Azariah king of Judah." As Menahem became king in the thirty-ninth of king Azariah, and reigned ten years, he must have died in the forty-ninth year of Azariah. If, therefore, his son ascended the throne only in the fiftieth year of Azariah, some months elapsed between the death of Menahem and Pekahiah's accession, because, probably in the unsettled state of the kingdom, his right to the throne was contested. He held it also only two years, as his adjutant (שָׁלִישׁ see above p. 145) Pekah conspired against him, and, with fifty Gileadites, put him to death. V. 25. "Smote him in the castle (אַרְמוֹן 1 Ki. xvi. 18, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 152) of the king's house with Argob and Arieh." אֶת־אַרְגֹּב וְאֶת־הָאַרְיֵה most interpreters understand so, that Argob and Arieh were Pekah's accomplices,

Astyages, the former of whom delivered Media from the Assyrian supremacy, the latter, with Labynetus or Nabopolassar, took Nineveh, and put an end to the Assyrian empire (Herod. i. 95 f. and 106.)—So much for our purpose concerning this question; its farther investigations see in Hupfeld, whose line of proof is not quite free from error, but at all events deserves the commendation, which has been briefly given to it by H. Leo in the Berl. Yahrbb. f. Wissensch. Krit. 1844, April, 72, p. 575 f.

[1] Even those who understand גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל of warriors have acknowledged the weight of this argument, and hence S. Schm. will thus conceive the sense, *quod Menahem istam pecuniam impossuerit universo Israeli, nec viris quidem fortibus exceptis;* but this is an arbitrary addition to the text. But J. D. Mich. endeavoured to remove the difficulty by the hypothesis, that at that time the military form of government arising from the civil wars, existed among the ten tribes, and the soldiers exacted the tax imposed upon them from others again who were subordinate to them. Quite improbable and irreconcilable with the text.

who were conjoined with him in slaying the king; but the words immediately following, "and with him fifty of the sons of the Gileadites," appear more to favour the view of S. Schm., *quod Argob et Arjeh fuerint duo principes Pekachjae, quorum potentiam et auctoritatem timuerit Pekach ideoque cum rege eos trucidaverit.*

Vv. 27—31. *Reign of Pekah* (פֶּקַח) *the son of Remaliah.* Under him the Assyrian king Tiglath Pileser (תִּגְלַת פִּלְאֶסֶר or תִּגְלַת פִּלְנֶאסֶר xvi. 7, פִּלְנֶסֶר or תִּגְלַת פִּלְנֶסֶר 1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Chr. xxviii. 20)[1] came, conquered a part of the country and carried its inhabitants into captivity to Assyria. This took place in the last year of Pekah, in the beginning of the reign of Ahaz king of Judah, comp. v. 37.—V. 29. Concerning the towns Ijon and Abel-beth-maachab (Abil), see on 1 Ki. xv. 20. Janoah (יָנוֹחַ) is to be sought between Abil and Kedesh, or at least in their neighbourhood.[2] Kedesh (קֶדֶשׁ) a city of refuge belonging to the Levites on the mountains of Naphtali (Jos. xix. 37, xx. 7, xxi. 32), on the west side of the Sea of Merom, twenty Roman miles from Tyre, the birth-place of Barak (Judg. iv. 6, comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 129 f.), still exists as a village under the old name on the hills west of Huleh, comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 622. In this region lay Hazor, see above p. 141. "And Gilead and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali." As the last words

[1] V. Bohlen (*Symbolae* p. 24) explained the name of this king, who is nowhere else mentioned, quite unnaturally تيغلد پيلسر اذر Tig-lad-pil-adzer, *gladius intrepidus (est) elephas ignis i.e. Dei;* much more probably Gesen. in his *lex. man s. v., Dominus Tigris,* according to which תגלת will stand for Diglath, the river Tigris.

[2] Decidely false is the assumption of Winer (R. W. i. 630) and Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 863), that ינוח is the border city of Ephraim and Manasseh mentioned Jos. xvi. 6 f., which according to Euseb. lay twelve Roman miles east of Neapolis (Sichem.) For Galilean cities are here spoken of. The Reviewer of v. Raumer's Pal. in the Münchner gel. Anz. 1836, Nov. No. 242, p. 902, is disposed to find Janoah in the large village Januach inhabited by Druses, which was found by St. Schulz in the mountain tracts north east of Acre, and is used by the principal inhabitants of Acre as a summer residence, see Paulus' Samml. von Reis. vii. p. 98. But this also lies too far remote. to have been reckoned to the territory of Naphtali.

are annexed without כָּל it might appear, that they were a comprehensive description of all the fore-mentioned places and districts, especially as Galilee includes the northern district of the tribe of Naphtali (see above p. 131.) Accordingly Gesen. comm. on Is. i. p. 352) thinks, that Gilead here as often denotes a very small district, even a city (Hos. vi. 5), and that the writer, notwithstanding the small exception (namely, that Gilead lay on the other side of Jordan), may have included all the before-named places, under the general name, the whole land of Naphtali. But that Gilead does not denote a city in Hos. vi. 5, has been rightly observed by Winer (R. W. i. p. 504.) As little can it be proved that this name is used of a very small district of Perea, lying to the east of Merom. We can therefore understand Gilead only of the whole territory of the Israelites east of the Jordan, 1 Chr. v. 6 and 26, demands this, and must therefore take כָּל־אֶרֶץ נפ״ in apposition with הַגִּלְעָדָה which it more strictly defines. But the enumeration is not therefore altogether without order, as Cler. appealing to the simplicity of the Hebrew style which *minus accuratum ordinem nequaquam respuit*, imagines, but purely historical, that is, following the actual order of the conquests. Tiglath Pileser first took the several partly fortified cities adjacent to the sea of Merom, then turned to Gilead, conquered this district, and on his return thence, the remaining part of Galilee, namely, the whole land of Naphtali.[1] Comp. still on xvii. 6.—V. 30. Pekah met with his death by a conspiracy formed by Hoshea the son of Elah, who assumed the sovereignty "in the twentieth year of Jotham." This statement is very surprising, as Jotham reigned only sixteen years, and Ahaz had become king in the seventeenth year of Pekah (xvi. 1), according to which Pekah's death must have fallen properly in the fourth year of Ahaz. The reason of this extraordinary statement can

[1] In the annals of the kings the conquests of T. P. were probably mentioned each more at large, but it would have been too much for our author in epitomizing to specify them all: he therefore contents himself, after mentioning several cities, with including all the other places under the general terms Gilead and Galilee. Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 133) erroneously asserts, that our author only mentions Gilead, by the way, because the most part of it still belonged to the kingdom of Judah under Jotham.

only be sought with Ussher (*chronol. sacr.* p. 80) in this, that hitherto no mention had been made of Ahaz, Jotham's successor, because the reign of Jotham is first recorded in v. 32 ff.[1]

Vv. 32—38. *Reign of Jotham of Judah.* Comp. 2 Chr. xxvii. 1—9. The statement, "in the second year of Pekah . . . . Jotham became king," is explained by this, that the first year of Pekah, which coincides with the fifty-second of Uzziah, was not complete, inasmuch as he did not attain to the sovereignty in Nisan. For the beginning of Jotham's reign is not separated a

[1] All other conjectures, as for example that of Lightfoot (Op. i. p. 244), prove themselves at the first glance to be untenable; comp. Win. R. W. i. p. 724. Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 72 f.) has endeavoured to show in a peculiar manner, that instead of, "in the twentieth year of Jotham," is to be read, in the twentieth year of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, inasmuch as he makes Jotham reign eight years in conjunction with his father Uzziah, and after his death only eight years alone, and then lengthens the reign of Ahaz eight years, fixes it at twenty-four instead of sixteen years, and in order to save the synchronism of the history of Israel, assigns to Pekah also twenty-eight instead of twenty years, whereby the eight years' interregnum usually assumed between Pekah and Hoshea falls away, while the collective period of the kings is not altered, because the interval between the death of Uzziah and the beginning of Hezekiah's reign is still thirty-two years, and these thirty-two years are made up, only not with the Books of Kings and Chronicles by the sixteen + sixteen years of the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, but by the eight years of Jotham and twenty-four years of Ahaz. But the whole combination stands upon the weakest possible footing. Besides our statement, "in the twentieth year of Jotham," the force of which is fully neutralized not only by the other dates, but also by the circumstance that Hitzig must insert the words, "Ahaz the son of" to make it subserve his purpose, there is merely the age of Hezekiah at his accession to the throne, which demands a more than sixteen years' reign of Ahaz, because he must otherwise, according to xviii. 2, comp. with xvi. 2, have begotten Hezekiah in the eleventh year of his life, which is "purely impossible," for the farther assertion, that the statement v. 37, that Jotham was assailed in war by the Syrians and Ephraimites, is quite improbable, no one will hold to be demonstrated or demonstrable. And the statement concerning Hezekiah's age at the commencement of his reign will be shown to be devoid of evidence on xviii. 2. The whole hypothesis is shown to be untenable partly by the arbitrary manner in which a multitude of texts, namely, v. 33, xvi. 1 and 2, xvii. 1, 2 Chr. xxvii. 1, 8, xxviii. 1, must be altered at will, partly by this, that the time, during which Jotham conducted the government in his father's lifetime, is in vv. 5, 7, 2 Chr. xxvi. 21, 23, expressly and clearly distinguished from his sixteen years' reign after the death of Uzziah.

full year from that of Pekah, and therefore the sixteen years' reign of Jotham, which actually amounted only to fifteen years and some months, had terminated according to xvi. 1, in the seventeenth year of Pekah. Of Jotham's reign, besides the general description of it in the usual terms, nothing further is recorded, but that he built the higher gate of the temple; comp. on this the remarks on xi. 19. According to 2 Chr. xxviii. 3, he built besides an addition to the wall of Ophel, several cities in the mountains of Judah, and castles and towers in the forests, and reduced the rebellious Ammonites, so that they paid him tribute three years. Jotham accordingly prosecuted with vigour, what his father had begun and undertaken for the promotion of the outward prosperity of his kingdom. Comp. here the note on v. 3 ff.—V. 37. "In these days (that is towards the end of Jotham's reign), the Lord began to send against Judah, Rezin," etc. הֵחֵל בְּ *immisit calamitatem*, comp. Lev. xxvi. 22, Am. viii. 11. These words express more than the mere alliance of the kings of Israel and Syria, and their preparation for war, or the mere hostile disposition of these kings to Judah, as Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 269 thinks; they denote the actual beginning of the hostile invasion, which was continued after Jotham's death, so that the enemy appeared before Jerusalem in the first year of Ahaz, comp. on xvi. 5.

CHAPTER XVI.

REIGN OF AHAZ, KING OF JUDAH. COMP. 2 CHR. XXVIII.

Vv. 1—4. On the commencement of the reign of Ahaz, "in the seventeenth year of Pekah," see on xv. 32.—V. 2. Under the prosperous reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, with the increase of wealth and worldly power, luxury and voluptuousness, false self-confidence and forgetfulness of God, had become very prevalent among the people, as the first chapters of Isaiah abundantly testify. It cannot therefore surprise us, that the theocratic principle still externally maintained by those two kings

was abandoned by Ahaz, that under his reign sincere dependence on Jehovah having vanished from the hearts of the people, disappeared also from their outward conduct, that Ahaz "did not that which was right in the eyes of the Lord his God, like David his father" (v. 2), as his predecessors, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham, had not acted altogether as David (xii. 3, xiv. 3, xv. 3 and 39), that he "walked in the way of the kings of Israel" (v. 3), that he dedicated his son to Molech by fire, that he "sacrificed and burned incense in the high places, and on the hills and under every green tree" (v. 4), that is, that by him the worship of images, high places and false gods of every kind was introduced into the whole land. Yet we are not so to understand the idolatry of Ahaz, as if the worship of Jehovah was immediately discontinued. This corresponds with the character of polytheism, which only in special cases becomes the fanatical persecutor of other gods and religions, but in general seeks to venerate several gods beside each other, in direct opposition to the worship of Jehovah, which is degraded into idolatry by any equalization of Jehovah with another God (see above, p. 162.) Only in the last years of his reign does Ahaz proceed so far in his idolatry as to suspend the external temple worship of Jehovah, and shut up the doors of the temple (2 Chr. xxviii. 24.)—The description of the religious conduct of this king in our verses gives only a summary account of his idolatry, from which we are not to conclude that Ahaz introduced the different kinds of idolatry all at one time. Much rather did he proceed from step to step, and the offering of his son to Molech obviously occurred only at the time when he was hard pressed by the Assyrians, from whom he expected aid.—The words, "he walked in the way of the kings of Israel," to which is added, 2 Chr. xxviii. 2, by way of explanation, "and made also molten images for Baalim," denote in the first place only the self-devised worship of Jehovah by images; for this was the way in which all the kings of Israel walked from first to last; though the phrase is so used of Joram, king of Judah, in viii. 18, that it denotes at the same time the Baal worship of the dynasty of Ahab. In this sense, that is, denoting the worship of images and of Baal at the same time, is it here also to be taken.—V. 3. Even his son he caused to go through the fire, that is, he offered him to Molech in the valley of Ben-

hinnom (xxiii. 10.) Instead of בֵּן stands in 2 Chr. xxviii. 3 the plural בָּנָיו, and in v. 16, מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר for the singular מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, although the reference is only to the one Assyrian king, Tiglath Pileser, in order to express generally the thought, which rests not in the number but the thing, in which case many languages occasionally employ the plural; comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 664, Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 584 f, and Winer Gramm. des neutestl. Spr. p. 200 f. of the 5th ed. As to the matter of fact we have here the first historically attested human sacrifice among the Israelites. In the Pentateuch, indeed, there are several warnings against the Canaanatish abominations of the sacrifice of children to Molech (Lev. xviii. 21; Deut. xviii. 10), and the punishment of stoning is prescribed for this transgression, but in case of neglect the extirpation of the transgressor is threatened by the Lord (Lev. xx. 2—5); but there is no proof that this abominable idolatry was actually practised in Israel before the times of Ahaz; for, as Movers Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 65 quite correctly remarks, "otherwise the abomination would certainly not have been passed over in silence by the biblical writers, who so often make mention of other forms of idolatry."[1] The phrase

[1] Movers is also certainly right, when he (p. 64 f., 324, etc.) derives the introduction of the worship of Molech from the first entrance of the Assyrians into Judea, and from this time forward assumes an intermixture of the Canaanitish idolatry with the Upper Asiatic or Assyrian fire-worship, even though the proofs adduced are much in need of a critical examination. According to the Old Testament, indeed, the worship of Molech is found among the Canaanites even in the times of Moses, for it is enumerated in the Pentateuch as in our passage among the abominations of the nations, which the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel (comp. Lev. xviii. 21, with v. 24 ff.; Deut. xviii. 9, 10, 12); but it is not therefore necessary that it should be of Canaanitish origin. For had it arisen among them, or been even their principal form of worship, how could we account for it, that it is not named from the time of Joshua to the Assyrian period among the various Canaanitish superstitions into which the Israelites almost at all times more or less fell? Its manifestation in Ahab's time can scarcely be otherwise viewed than in intimate connexion with the appearance of the Syrians in Palestine, whereby Movers, p. 65, is justified in the statement, "But when the Assyrian fire-gods, Adrammelech and Anammelech, became known, Ahaz first resumed the Canaanitish custom as the biblical writer remarks (comp. 2 Ki. xvi. 3), and from that time first is mentioned the valley of Hinnom with its sacrifices of children, which were there offered to Baal as Molech (comp. 2 Ki. xxxiii.

הֶעֱבִיר אֶת־בְּנוֹ בָּאֵשׁ here, xvii. 17, xxi. 6; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 6; Ezek. xx. 31, is virtually equivalent to הַעֲבִיר בְּנוֹ לַמֹּלֶךְ (Lev. 10; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 6; Jer. vii. 31, xix. 5; Ezek. xvi. 20, xxiii. 37,") After this let any one judge with what right P. v. Bohlen (d. alte Indien i. p. 304) could assert: "the horrible sacrifices of children were practised by the Hebrews from the brightest days of Solomon till after the exile," without even furnishing a single historical attestation of the statement. The same opinion is found in Winer (R.W. ii. p. 118) and others, who infer it from the identification of Molech with Milcom, which has been already refuted, p. 168 f. Finally Vatke (Rel. d. A. T. p. 190 ff. 245 and 685) asserts, that "the Israelites during the whole journey through the wilderness of Arabia, and even at a later period, worshipped Saturn as their national deity with animal and human sacrifices." But the proof of this assertion drawn from Amos v. 25 f. and Ezek. xx. 26, comp. xvi. 30 (perhaps 20), apart from the consideration of the perverse presupposition of Hegel, that the Jehovah religion developed itself only gradually till the 8th century B.C. step by step from rude nature worship, rests on an erroneous interpretation of the passages quoted. The words of Amos, "Have ye (says the Lord) offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? And ye bore the tabernacle of your king and the stand (כִּיּוּן) of your images, the star of your God, which ye made for yourselves," have no other meaning than this, that the great mass of the people of Israel, during the long period of their journey through the wilderness, neglected the worship of Jehovah by offerings, and instead of this adored a borrowed king of heaven with an idolatrous worship. But that this king of heaven, whose tabernacle and star they bore with them, was Saturn, is based upon the erroneous explanation of the word כִּיּוּן by Saturn, which is regarded as untenable even by Hitzig and Ewald. Comp. the excellent refutation of this opinion in Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 108—118. Ezekiel knows still less of the worship of Saturn by the sacrifice of children in the wilderness. When it is said, Ezek. xx. 24 ff., "Because they (the Israelites) did not adhere to my (God's) judgments in the wilderness. . . . . I polluted them in their own gifts in the presenting of all the first born, that I might make them desolate," here also in opposition to the reference of the words בהעביר כל פטר רחם to the sacrificing of children to Molech, which is still maintained even by Ewald and Umbreit, Hävern. (Comm. on Ezek. p. 315) has with perfect justice remarked: "It is altogether incorrect in the ancient writers, as Vitringa, *observ. ss.* p. 267 f., to think here immediately of a worship of Molech, as Movers recently concludes from this passage, that 'the Israelites in Egypt (sic!), as the prophet Ezekiel expressly asserts, dedicated all the first-born to Moloch,' die Phöniz. i. p. 328; comp. Vatke, p. 191. The prophet in this case could not possibly have omitted the essential באשׁ or למלך. Ezekiel then clearly

xviii. 21; Deut. xviii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 35) and הֶעֱבִיר לַמֹּלֶךְ (Lev. xx. 2—4), as appears from העביר את בנו באש למלך, 2 Ki. xxiii. 10, and denotes the sacrifice of children to Molech. The older theologians are at variance on the question whether this phrase mean an actual burning of the children offered to Molech or only a passing of them between two funeral piles, a mere *februatio* or lustration by fire, inasmuch as Spencer *de leg. Hebr. rit. l.* 2 *c.* 360 *sqq.*, Witsius *miscell. ss. l.* 2 *diss.* 5 (*tom.* i. p. 608 ff.), Pfeiffer, *dub. vex. cent.* iv. *loc.* 80, p. 832 and others assumed both usages as co-existing. Jarchi *ad Lev.* xviii. 21, Moses Maim. and others have declared for the mere *februatio*, Cler. *ad Lev.* xviii. 21, Budd. *hist eccl.* i. p. 608 ff. and. Mich. Mos. R.V., § 247 on the contrary for the burning. This last view is rightly regarded by the recent writers as alone correct, and is defended at length against the others by Gesen. in the *thes.* ii. 985. Compare also Movers p. 328. According to Ezek. xvi. 20 f., "Thou hast taken thy sons and daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and hast sacrificed these to them to be de-

alludes to Ex. xiii. 12, 13, but intentionally omits the there appearing לַיהוָה. He expresses himself indefinitely, and we are not to refer to v. 31, where he speaks of subsequent events, in order to define the meaning of the expression. The prophet admits, that they observed the law in regard to gifts, and the offering of the first-born, but in a perverted sense, inasmuch as they gave them a heathenish turn, and addicted themselves to nature worship, while they were externally attached to the worship of Jehovah." Moreover Movers has not cleared up either the question concerning the origin of the old Canaanitish Molech-worship, or that concerning the proper nature of Molech, by which is mostly understood the planet Saturn worshipped as a star of ill omen; for his assertion, that the ancestors of the Israelites, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites, who, according to the Old Testament, are confessedly only Abraham and Lot, had brought it from Upper Asia, from Chaldea, and Assyria, to Canaan (p. 63, 323, 333, 339, etc.), and that Molech had been blended with the old Canaanitish Baal or Bel into a Bel-Saturn, is at once refuted as erroneous by the fact, that Abraham and Lot were no worshippers of Molech, and did not enter into such close intercourse with the Canaanites, that these should have adopted the worship of Molech from them. Besides Molech is reckoned among the gods of the Canaanitish nations, who were to have been extirpated, and are uniformly distinguished from the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites. Thus the investigation concerning Molech is still in need of a critical review, which, however, cannot receive so brief and passing a notice, that we could compress it into a note.

voured. Was it too little in thy whoredom, that thou hast also *slain my children, and delivered them* בְּהַעֲבִיר אֹתָם לָהֶם," the offering consisted in the slaying and burning of children. Comp. also Ezek. xxii. 37; Jer. vii. 31, and xix. 5. Thus a burning alive cannot be intended, which even Hävern. p. 238 still finds possible in a manner not easy to comprehend, after he has immediately before mentioned the slaying as the first part (act) of the offering.[1] Both acts are usually denoted together by הֶעביר בּאשׁ or הֶעביר לַמֹּלֶךְ, for which in xvii. 31, and in Jer. vii. 31, is used שׂרף באשׁ, in 2 Chr. xxviii. 3 הֶעביר בּאשׁ, and in Jer. xix. 5 שׂרף לבעל, clearly proving that הֶעביר was an actual burning. Now as in point of expression a burning in the fire can scarcely be called a passing through the fire, we must agree with Movers, that "the burning of the children was regarded as a passing through, by which they attained to purification with the Deity after the dissolution of the earthly impure dross of the body," (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 329), while at the same time we must reject as fundamentally false the accompanying assertions, that the Israelites in Egypt had originally consecrated all the

[1] Certain and indubitable testimonies are wanting for the opinion that the children were burned alive. Eusebius in the principal passage of his *praep. ev. l.* iv. *c.* 16, where he enumerates the many human sacrifices of the ancients, mentions not a syllable of this horrid custom, but says, on the contrary, that at Salamis these victims were stabbed by the priests with spears in the belly (*κατὰ τοῦ στομάχου*) and then burned upon the kindled funeral piles (i. p. 164 ed. Hein), and besides speaks repeatedly by their *σφαγή* and *ἀποσφάττειν* (p. 165 ff.) Diod. Sic. also in *l.* xx. *c.* 12, where he describes the brazen statue of Kronos with its Molech arms outstretched and glowing with heat, says nothing of casting live children into them; and even passages quoted by Münter (Rel. d. Karth. p. 22) from Klitarch. and Photius by no means clearly exhibit this sense; but may as well be understood of the burning of children already dead; only the notice there quoted from Tzetzes of the brazen bulls used at Carthage in the sacrifice of children with pipes in their nostrils, so that the crying of the children sounded like the notes of pipes, would involve the burning of children alive, if Münter himself had not explained the latter as a later addition. In like manner this is presupposed in the description given by Jarchi *ad Jer.* vii. 31 of the statue of Molech. See the passage in Winer (R.W. ii. p. 119) and the representation of it according to this description in *Lundii* jud. Heiligth. p. 564. But Tzetzes and the Rabbins of the middle ages are very suspicious witnesses for a custom, which the older writers do not know.

first born to Molech (p. 328), and regarded Jehovah himself as Molech or the sacrificial fire devouring the children (p. 327), since they are not proved either by Ezek. xx. 26, or by Ex. xiii. 12, and Lev. xx. 3. For from the words, "I will cut him (who devotes his children to Molech) off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech to defile my sanctuary," (Lev. xx. 3), it no more follows, that the offering to Molech was made on the altar of the sanctuary of Jehovah, than as has been already remarked, that the worship of Molech is intended in Ezek. xx. 26. Movers' error has arisen from this, that he identifies the phrase הַעֲבִיר לַמֹּלֶךְ corresponding to הַעֲבִיר לַיהוָה with הַעֲבִיר בָּאֵשׁ, whereas it is, perhaps practically, but not philologically equivalent to this expression. העביר לידוה used of the first born (Ex. xiii. 12; Ezek. xx. 26) means, to cause to go over to the Lord (comp. for this signification of העביר Num. xxvii. 7, 8), give over, dedicate, offer to the Lord; on the contrary העביר באשׁ means, to cause to go through the fire. Now, if העביר למלך were used as practically equivalent to העביר באשׁ, this could only happen because the devoting of the children to Molech was effected by slaying and burning them in the fire, whereas the dedication of the first born to Jehovah consisted in this, that they were presented to the Lord in his sanctuary and redeemed (כל בכור בניך תפדה Ex. xiii. 13.) Movers quite falsely asserts, p. 328, "It is philologically false, that הבעיר can signify in general, to dedicate, offer;" for the presenting of the first-born denoted in Ex. xiii. 12 by העביר is in v. 15 expressly called זבח ליהוה and thus העביר is quite identified with זבח.—On v. 3 comp. 1 Ki. xiv. 23. וַיְזַבֵּחַ has *tsere* without the pause contrary to the general rule, see Ew. Gr. § 274 and 297.

V. 5. "Then came Rezin . . . and Pekah up to war against Jerusalem, and pressed hard upon Ahaz, but could not make war," that is, they intended to besiege Jerusalem and conquer it, but it did not come to a siege much less to a conquest, comp. Is. vii. 1. Deviating from this, 2 Chr. xxviii. 5—15 relates, that these two kings smote Ahaz, and carried home many captives with abundant spoil; but the Israelites at the expostulation of the prophet Oded released their captives again,

and sent them back fed and clothed to the city of palm trees to their brethren. This account Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 269), Winer (R.W. i. p. 44), Maur., and others, pronounced to be irreconcilable with the relation of our verse and of Isaiah, and then rejected as an unhistorical exaggeration of the writer, whereas long before them the older interpreters recognized the two relations as supplementing each other, and reconciled them with one another, see my apol. Vers. p. 420 ff. But Chronicles tells not of a campaign which occurred after the expedition mentioned in our verse, as Grot. on 2 Chr. xviii. 5, and Ussher, *Annal. ad. a. m.* 3262 f., suppose, but of the events which preceded it, as most expositors rightly understand. The war which, according to xv. 37, began in the end of the reign of Jotham, was opened with the irruption of both kings into Judah, in which the Syrians and Israelites smote the Jewish army and took many prisoners. On this the two kings marched together to Jerusalem, but could effect nothing against this city, because Ahaz meanwhile had invited the Assyrian king Tiglath Pileser to his aid, and the latter had already invaded Syria, so that Rezin and Pekah, without having effected their object, retired from Jerusalem into their own country to defend it against the mighty Assyrian foe. But whether these two leading events, on the one hand the battle fought by the Syrians and Israelites with the Jews, recorded in Chronicles, on the other hand the subsequent united march of the two kings to Jerusalem, were only two main movements of the one great and prolonged campaign, as Lightf. *Op.* i. p. 101, Plüschke in Keil's and Tzschirner's Anal. i. 2, p. 46, Hengstenb. Christol. i. 2, p. 48, Kleinert, Echth. d. Jes. p. 45, and others, have supposed, or two different campaigns, the latter of which was undertaken a year after the former, as Vitringa and Rosenm. on Is. vii. with Hieron., Jarchi, and Buddeus (*h. eccl.* ii. p. 425) have represented the course of affairs, this cannot be determined with certainty, and does not materially affect the main point.[1]

[1] Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 142 ff.) and Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 217 f.) therefore err when they so put the matter, as if those who explain both narratives only of one campaign, understood them also, like Gesen., of one and the same event, and their counter reasons, so far as they have any force, only prove the diversity of the events, but not the existence

V. 6. "At that time Rezin brought Elath to Aram, which the Jews under Uzziah had regained, comp. on xiv. 22. By בָּעֵת הַהִוא this conquest is only placed in general in the course of the war of the Syrians with Ahaz, not necessarily after their campaign against Jerusalem. On the contrary it must have preceded it and occurred after the defeat of Ahaz's army (2 Chr. xxviii. 5) because Ahaz, by calling in the Assyrian, had forced Rezin to desist from the siege of Jerusalem, so that he had no time to penetrate farther south and make conquests in Edom. "And the Edomites came to Elath and dwelt there unto this day." Many expositors after the Chald., Syr., and Arab versions take אֲרוֹמִים only for another form of אֲרַמִּים Aramaeans, Syrians, and this appears at first sight to be suitable; but on a farther consideration of the matter this view proves to be untenable. For as the Syrian kingdom was destroyed very soon after this campaign, and the Syrians were carried into captivity (v. 9), they cannot have dwelt long in Elath; comp. Mov. Krit. Unters. p. 151. If, therefore, the words, "they dwelt there unto this day," are even taken from the annals of the kings, and do not originate first with the author of our books, yet they suit not the Aramaeans but only the Edomites. We prefer, therefore, with the LXX., Vulg., the Masor., and most expositors, even Rob. Pal. iii. p. 109, the reading אֱדוֹמִים Edomites, as the origin of the variant ארומים from אדומים may be easily explained by the foregoing ארם, whereas, in case it had originally stood ארמים, there is no conceivable reason for the origin of the reading אדומים, except perhaps an unthinking error of transcription. But אדומים by no means warrants us with L. Capell, Cler., Mich., Dathe, and others to change אֲרָם also into אֱדוֹם, as הֵשִׁיב does not necessarily imply an earlier possession. After the Edomites again came into possession of Elath, and by the

of two independent campaigns. Hävernick allowed himself to be led too much by the representations of Movers, as he did not observe that his line of argument so explains the predictions of Isaiah i. and ii. 4 as if the prophet had given a chronological account of these events, whereas these predictions are not even uttered in the times of Ahaz, as Häv. himself has elsewhere (Einl. ii. 2, p. 66 f.) proved, still less do they exclusively treat of them.

destruction of the Syrian power also became independent of them, they themselves invaded Judah and carried off spoil, 2 Chr. xxviii. 17.[1]

Vv. 7—9. In this strait Ahaz, without regarding the encouraging prediction of Is. vii., that the kings of Syria and Ephraim were only like firebrands still smoking, and, notwithstanding the warning of the prophet against an alliance with Assyria, applied to Tiglath Pileser, and by the transmission of the treasures of the temple and the palace purchased for himself the aid of the Assyrians, so that Tiglath Pileser advanced against Damascus and took it, slew king Rezin and carried the inhabitants of Damascus into captivity to Kir.[2] The time when Ahaz

[1] The Philistines also invaded Judah and conquered several towns of the low country (2 Chr. xxviii. 18), in order to avenge themselves for the humiliation they had received under Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 6.) This account receives a striking confirmation from Is. xiv. 28—32, comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 494, Hitzig, Jesaj. p. 175, my apol. Vers. p. 240, and Havern. Einl. 2, 1, p. 219 f., as also our remarks on xviii. 8.

[2] Of the proceedings of Tiglath Pileser against the kingdom of Israel nothing is here said. Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 154) thence concludes: "that no serious disaster befel it at that time," and, p. 133, rejects even the correct assumption, that the deportation of the inhabitants of Naphtali and Gilead took place after the conquest and exile of the Syrians, as "quite unfounded and obviously false, because the author of the Book of Kings would not have here passed it over in silence." But if any *argumentum e silentio* is quite unfounded and obviously false, so undoubtedly is this, which cannot be sustained by some misunderstood expressions of Isaiah (viii. 23 and xvii. 2.) According to Mov. this deportation of the Israelites by Tiglath Pileser, which is also confirmed by 1 Chr. v. 6 and 26, must have taken place *before* his expedition against Syria. But had Movers only considered the geographical relation of Syria and Gilead to Assyria he would have been convinced of the complete untenableness of his assertion. Or did he not know that there was no other military way from Assyria or Mesopotamia from which Tiglath Pileser must have come to hither Asia than that leading by Thapsacus over the Euphrates, and thence either by Emesa or Palmyra to Damascus, by which all the conquerors from upper Asia invaded Palestine (comp. C. Ritter's Erdk. Th, x. Asien Bd. vii. p. 11 and 1114), and thus that Tiglath Pileser could not reach either the land of Naphtali or Gilead without marching through the Syrian kingdom from Damascus? But our author did not require to mention this expedition here, because he had already related it, xv. 29, in the history of the kingdom of Israel. Besides, not to speak of the older interpreters, Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 352) has rightly connected

applied to Tiglath Pileser for help is not here distinctly given; but it lies in the nature of the thing, that he took this step when the enemies, after conquering his army, prepared to march to Jerusalem ere they made their appearance before this city; with which also Is. vii. and viii. agree, comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 69. הַקּוֹמִים עָלָי, "who rise up against me," that is, assault and make war upon me. With regard to the form קוֹמִים for קָמִים see Ew. Gr. § 326 p. 201.—קִיר Kir (Is. xxii. 6; Am. i. 5, ix. 7), which the Vulg. has erroneously understood of *Cyrene*, is, according to a conjecture made by Bochart *(Phal.* iv. 32), taken by Calm., Mich. (Spicil. ii. p. 121, *Suppl. ad lex.* p. 2191), Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 102 f.), Winer (R.W. ii. p. 777), Gesen. *(thes.* iii. 1210, and Comm. on Is. i. p. 688), and others, for the country along the river Kur (*Κῦρος, Κῦρος* of the ancients), which unites with the Araxes and falls into the Caspian Sea. But as this river formed the boundary between Armenia Major, Iberia, and Albania (comp. Forbiger, Hdb. d. alten Geogr. 1844 ii. p. 74, 598), and thus flowed north of Armenia, this district can scarcely have belonged at that time to the Assyrian empire, as the murderers of Sennacherib fled to the land of Ararat, and, therefore, no doubt beyond the bounds of the Assyrian empire (xix. 37), and in general Armenia occurs in the Old Testament under the names of Ararat, Togarmah, and Minni. If we compare the collective passages in which mention is made of Kir, it is more natural according to Is. xxii. 6, where it is named along with Elam, and both nations are described as good archers, to think with Bochart (Phal. iv. 32) of the city *Κουρήνα* mentioned by Ptolemaeus vi. 2 on the river Mardus in the south of Media, as the borderers on the Mardus are celebrated as good archers (see C. Ritter's Erdk. viii. Asien vi. 1, p. 615), or still more probably with Vitringa on Is. xxii. 6 of the city *Καρίνη*, situated at all events in Media (Ptol. vi. 2), the present Kerend (see C. Ritter ix. As. vi. 2, p. 391), in favour

this captivity of the Israelites with the taking of Damascus by Tiglath Pileser as an event of the same war, although he has erroneously assumed that the captivity of the Naphtalites took place a campaign earlier, and formed the prelude to the other invasions of the Assyrians, in refutation of which Hitzig (Jesaj. p. 70) has appealed to the geographical relation of the two countries.

of which it may be added, that the Chald. in our passage has rendered קִיר by קִרְיְנָא. On the contrary Amos ix. 7, according to which the Aramaeans descended from Shem (Gen. x. 22) emigrated from Kir to Syria, might point to a district lying in the north of Mesopotamia or in Chaldaea rather than to a region beyond the Tigris: although we know far too little of the most ancient seats of the Shemitic races to lay much stress on this point. It is very possible that the original seat of the Shemites is to be sought in the upper highlands of the river Kerkha, on which Kerend lies (Ritter ix. p. 323 ff.), and that Kir was also situated there.

Vv. 10—16. While Tiglath Pileser remained at Damascus, Ahaz paid him a visit of homage, probably in order to make himself more secure of his favour. Here he saw an altar which pleased him, and sent therefore a sketch and model of it to Uriah the priest, with orders to build a similar altar in Jerusalem; which he had executed on the return of the king (vv. 10, 11.) On this altar Ahaz, after his return to Jerusalem, offered his burnt-offering, meat-offering, and drink-offering, and removed the altar of Solomon from its place on the north side of the court, and ordered Uriah the priest to perform all the sacrifices henceforth on his new altar (vv. 12—15.) And Uriah obeyed also this order (v. 16.)[1] Proceeding on the supposition that this new altar was dedicated to idols (a supposition which Theodore and Procop. entertained), the older interpreters endeavoured to answer the question, why Ahaz chose the gods, not of the victorious Assyrians, but of the vanquished Syrians. Seb. Schm. replies, *Nimirum jam agnoscebat Assyrium hostem potius quam amicum cum diis Assyriis: cogitabatque de ejusmodi diis, qui ipsum contra Assyrium et deos ejus defenderent. Ubi homo*

[1] If de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 252) finds this compliance of the priest "very scandalous," and seeks herein a proof of the non-existence of the Pentateuch, Häv. (Einl. i. 2, p. 597) has on the contrary replied with justice, that examples are not wanting of similar falsely submissive conduct on the part of the priests toward the king, and pointed to the fact, that the narrative implies no entire apostasy from Jehovah. But when he farther remarks, that Ahaz had distinguished this priest before as a favourite, the historical proofs of this are wanting, as Gesenius, to whose comm. on Is. viii. 2 he refers, only offers the conjecture, that "this priest appears to have stood high in his favour."

stultus deos Syrorum, quos prius putabat adversus se fuisse validos, elegit potius quam Jehovam verum Deum. Quod vero dii Syri Rezinum non defendissent adversus Assyrios, pro sua cæcitate alii potius cuicunque casui, non infirmitati deorum istorum adscribebat. But who could believe this? Had Ahaz then regarded the Assyrians as his enemies, he would not surely have paid a visit to Damascus. The whole supposition, that this altar was consecrated to the Syrian, or as some think, to the Assyrian gods, is false. According to the intention of the king it was to be consecrated to Jehovah, and therefore he caused it to be erected in the temple of Jehovah, and the sacrifices prescribed in the law to be offered on it (v. 15); and the reason why he wished to substitute it for Solomon's altar of burnt-offering lay simply in this, that it pleased him better than the old one of Solomon. That which was sinful in this was the *inepta ἐθελοθρησκεία*, as Budd. (hist. eccl. ii. p. 428) quite correctly designates the reason of this innovation, or that he, according to his idolatrous tendencies not regarding the difference between heathen and theocratic forms of worship, made arbitrary changes in the temple of Jehovah contrary to the command of the Lord, who, to guard against idolatry, did not commit the structure and forms of the places of worship built for his name to human fancy, and therefore revealed to Moses and David the patterns of the sanctuaries to be built for him (Ex. xxv. 40, xxiv. 30; 1 Chr. xxviii. 19.) Therefore was every altar erected by private choice compared to an altar of idols, even though it was not, like that of Ahaz, constructed after the model of an idolatrous altar.[1] The form דּוּמֶשֶׂק appears to be merely an error of

[1] The passage, 2 Chr. xxviii. 23, "Ahaz sacrificed to the gods of Damascus, who smote him, and said, The gods of the kings of Aram, who help them, to them will I sacrifice, that they may help me. And they were the ruin of him and of all Israel," is perfectly reconcilable with what is above stated. For if the statement actually refer to this altar, it might be regarded as an explanation of the writer, who, regarding the inclination of the king as an act, designated the offerings on the altar, which was built after the model of an altar consecrated to the gods of Damascus, as really presented to these gods themselves. With much greater probability, however, the statement of Chronicles refers not to this altar, but to sacrifices which Ahaz actually offered on בָּמוֹת to the gods of Damascus, before he went to Damascus to Tig-

the pen for דַּרְמֶשֶׂק 1 Chr. xviii. 5 f.; 2 Chr. xxviii. 23.—Uriah the priest is probably the same as the person, whom Isaiah (ch. viii. 2) was to take as witness of his prediction. דְּמוּת likeness, תַּבְנִית pattern, model.—V. 13. The words, "and (Ahaz) burned his burnt-offering," etc., are not to be understood as if the king had himself in offering performed the functions belonging to the priests, but only that he caused offerings to be made for him on this altar by the obsequious priests, comp. v. 15.—The fourteenth verse, "And the brazen altar, which was before Jehovah, he brought from (its place) before the house of Jehovah, between the (new) altar and between the house of Jehovah, and put it on the north side of the (new) altar" are so misunderstood by the Rabb. and Vatabl., as if Ahaz had placed his new altar between the brazen altar and the porch of the temple on the north side; on the contrary Ahaz removed the altar of Solomon from its place, and had it conveyed to the north side of the court, and his new altar set in the place of the old before the middle of the temple. וַיִּקְרֵב means not *removit*, but *admovit*, and is connected with עַל־יְרֵךְ וגו׳ notwithstanding the introduction of וַיִּתֵּן אֹתוֹ for the sake of greater clearness, as Maurer has rightly observed.—With respect to the article before the *nom. regens* in the *stat. constr.* הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת, comp. Ew. Gr. § 514.—V. 15. All offerings, which the Mosaic law prescribed, as well the daily morning and evening sacrifice, as the special burnt-offerings, meat and drink-offerings to be presented by the king or the whole people, were henceforth to be offered on the new altar, and also the blood, as the law required in these offerings, was to be sprinkled upon it, from which it is evident, that this new altar was to supply altogether the place of the altar of burnt-offering consecrated to the Lord in the temple. Concerning

lath Pileser and before Tiglath Pileser took Damascus, and by the conquest of the Syrians according to the opinions of the heathen, exposed the weakness of their gods. The author of Chronicles has omitted the building of the new altar after the model of that at Damascus as of no importance in comparison with the other sins of Ahaz, but not, as de Wette asserted, to save the honour of the true worship. Comp. in reply to this assertion Hertz i. p. q. p. 107 ff. and my apol. Vers. p. 386 f.

the brazen altar Ahaz declares in the first instance only יְהִיָה־לִי לְבַקֵּר, "it will be for me to consider," that is, I shall bethink myself concerning it and then determine farther. On this meaning of בָּקַר see Prov. xx. 25.—The *Kethibh* יְצַוֵּנוּ requires no change; the *pron. suff.* stands before the *nomen*, as often especially in the broader popular language, comp. Ew. Gr. § 562.

Vv. 17, 18. Ahaz interfered also with the other articles in the court. He cut off the pannels from the bases and removed the laver from off them, took down the brazen sea also from the brazen oxen on which it stood, and placed it on the pavement of stones. קִצֵּץ, to cut off, is used xviii. 17, xxiv. 13, of the separation of the platings of massive gold, and denotes here also the separation or cutting away of the pannels adorned with sculpture. The ו before אֵת־הַכִּיּוֹר can only have come into the text by an error of the pen. מַרְצֶפֶת אֲבָנִים is the floor of the court paved with stones probably in Mosaic work. Interpreters differ in opinion as to the object of Ahaz in interfering with these works of art. Cler. and Budd. *l.c.* think he perhaps used the copper for coining, or sold it for other objects, or sent it to the king of Assyria. But these conjectures are refuted by the circumstance that the bases and the brazen sea were still extant at the destruction of Jerusalem (xxv. 13, Jer. i. lii. 20), by which it appears distinctly enough that Ahaz neither melted, alienated, nor entirely destroyed them, nor in fact did anything more than what is here expressly stated, so that one of his successors, no doubt the pious Hezekiah, was able to restore them in his reformation of religion. There is much probability therefore in the conjecture of Züllig (die Cherubim-Wagen p. 56), that Ahaz wished not so much to destroy these things, as to employ the elaborate sculpture on the borders of the bases and the oxen of the brazen sea, in adorning another place, perhaps his own palace, perhaps an idol temple. For had he wished to destroy them, he would not have been contented with merely cutting off the panels from the bases or removing the brazen sea from the oxen on which it rested.[1] But, lastly, Ahaz went so far as to close the temple

[1] Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 66—68) has made quite new discoveries from our verses and some passages of Hosea. Thus from

doors, 2 Chr. xxviii. 24.—V. 18. "And the covered way of the Sabbath, which they had built at the house, and the outer entry of the king he removed into the house of the Lord on account of the king of Assyria." This notice is very obscure, because neither מֵיסַךְ הַשַּׁבָּת, nor מָבוֹא הַמֶּלֶךְ הַחִיצוֹנָה is mentioned anywhere else, and in general our accounts of the arrangement of the court of Solomon's temple are extremely defective. Of the different opinions enumerated by C. a Lap. and Calm. the most probable is that intimated by Grotius, that it was a covered portico, through which the priests entered the temple on the Sabbath *ad inchoandam ἐφημερίαν*, (comp. on מיסך Ges. *thes.* ii. 953), for to think with the Rabb. of a covered tent outside the temple, where the people whom the court could not contain assembled, is not a probable supposition. מבוא המלך החיצונה is a private external entrance for the king into the temple (see above p. 151), not, as some think, the royal station in the temple

Hos. x. 5, 6, and viii. 5, 6, he concludes, that the Assyrians *under Pul* removed the gods of Samaria, that is, the golden calves, and from Hos. viii. 4, and xiii. 2, that "the Israelites made new ones, which appear to have been afterwards carried away by the Assyrians (comp. 2 Ki. xxiii. 15, Judg. xviii. 30.)" He farther asserts, that *at the command of Tiglath Pileser (?)* Ahaz removed the brazen sea from the brazen oxen to a pediment of mere stones (comp. Ex. xx. 25, [?]), and "*likewise on account of the Assyrian king (?)* destroyed the oxen, cherubim, lions, palms on the scutcheons of the brazen bases in the court, and mutilated likewise the temple furniture (2 Chr. xxviii. 24)," and also removed the brazen altar of burnt-offering from its place to the north, in order to make room for the star worshippers to pay adoration to the sun, etc. Then from all this follow the conclusions, that symbols of animals were extremely distasteful to the Assyrians, and that the Assyrian star-worship quite coincided with the Persian, because Xerxes also removed the images from Greece as the Assyrians did from Syria and Palestine. Here at length indeed it occurs to him, that, according to 2 Ki. xvii. 30, the colonists transplanted by Esarhaddon to Samaria erected images of their native gods in the cities of Samaria, but he sets aside the objection to his assertions arising from this fact by the remark, that among the Assyro-Persian nations not the representation of the gods in general but only in human form (*ἀνθρωποειδῆ ἀγάλματα*, Beros. p. 69) was forbidden, while animal symbols were popular. Consequently, according to Movers' opinion, the golden calves, and the oxen, cherubims, lions of the brazen sea, and on the pannels of the bases were no animal symbols, but gods in human shape!! To controvert such absurd conclusions and groundless assertions would be an unprofitable waste of time!

court. So much is clear, that the covered way of the Sabbath as well as the external entrance of the king were outside the temple walls, and the change made by Ahaz consisted in removing it into the temple, מִפְּנֵי מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר from fear of the king of Assyria, that he might secure the entrance of the temple from him.[1]

Vv. 19, 20. With regard to the burial of the godless Ahaz, 2 Chr. xxviii. 27 states more precisely, that he was buried in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings.

CHAPTER XVII.

REIGN OF HOSHEA, THE LAST KING OF ISRAEL, TAKING OF SAMARIA AND REMOVAL OF THE ISRAELITES TO ASSYRIA AND MEDIA BY SHALMANESER, VV. 1—6; REFLECTIONS ON THE FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL, VV. 7—23; AND TRANSPLANTING OF HEATHEN COLONISTS INTO THE DEPOPULATED TERRITORY, VV. 24—41.

Vv. 1, 2. "In the twelfth year of Ahaz . . . . became Hoshea the son of Elah king, etc." As, according to xv. 30, Hoshea conspired against Pekah in the fourth year of Ahaz, slew him, and assumed to be king in his stead, but, according to our verse, he actually became king in the twelfth year of Ahaz, the throne must have been contested with him for eight years. Most interpreters and chronologists therefore have rightly assumed an anarchy of eight years between Pekah and Hoshea, inasmuch as the dates in our verse and in xv. 30 prove themselves to be cor-

[1] Ahaz evidently apprehended, as J. D. Mich. rightly conjectures, that the king of Assyria called to his aid might take a fancy to make himself master of the city, and in that case a certain covered portico of the temple and an entrance into it from the outside might be of advantage to him in the siege of the city. This notice therefore with all its obscurity affords a sufficiently clear testimony to the truth of the statement of Chronicles, called in question by Ges. comm. on Is. i. p. 269, namely that the king of Assyria called to his aid by Ahaz did not help, but oppress him.

rect by their agreement with the preceding and following chronological data, comp. on xv. 30 and xviii. 9 f.[1]—V. 2. "He did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him." Wherein Hoshea was favourably distinguished from his predecessors is not stated. Some Rabb. thought it was by this, that he did not prohibit his subjects, as the earlier kings of Israel, from visiting the temple at Jerusalem, as Hezekiah, according to 2 Chr. xxx. 10, invited the Israelites to the passover from the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulon, and according to vv. 11 and 18 also several from Ephraim and Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Zebulon, appeared at the feast. But this invitation to the passover took place after the conquest of Samaria and deportation of the greater part of the Israelites in the sixth year of Hezekiah, as is abundantly evident from 2 Chr. xxx. 6—9. At all events so much is implied in the words of our verse, that Hoshea was more anxious than his predecessors to reign theocratically, but wherein he showed this cannot be ascertained. Although less godless than the former kings of Israel, yet he could not escape the Divine judgment. *Solet nimirum Deus pœnam majorum differre ex sua longanimitate, si forte posteri seriam agant pœniten-*

[1] An interregnum of eight or nine years has been assumed by Ussher, *annal. m.* p. 51, *des Vign. Chronol.* i. p. 390 ff., Offerhaus, Bengel, Winer (R. W. i. p. 609), Tiele, Chronol. p. 73, and others. Comp. Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 417 ff., and Maurer, *commentatt. l. c.* p. 289. On the contrary several Rabb., Vatabl. and Grot., were of opinion, that Hoshea was subjected by the Assyrian king from the fourth to the twelth year of Ahaz, and therefore these years were not reckoned as years of his reign till the time when he revolted from him. Lastly, according to Lightfoot (*Op.* i. p. 103), no king of Samaria was mentioned in the period from the fourth to the twelfth year of Ahaz, *quia Hoseas nondum constabilitus erat in throno sed cohibitus per Assyrium usque ad annum duodecimum Achasi, quo demum tempore illum ibi regem constituit.* But both assumptions are at variance with v. 3, in conformity with which Shalmaneser made Hoshea subject and tributary to him after he became king, which cannot be understood of the time before the twelfth year of Ahaz. Besides, in all probability Tiglath Pileser was still reigning in the fourth year of Ahaz, and was only returned to his dominions after the removal of the Syrians and Gileadites. And even if Tiglath Pileser was then dead, his successor could not have already appeared in the land of Israel, either to conquer Hoshea or to oppose his accession to the throne.

tiam, quod si non fit, etsi hi minus mali sint, ad vindictam tandem procedit ira Dei, coll. Ex. xx. 5. S. Schm.

V. 3. "Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria." The old theologians find the occasion of this expedition of Shalmaneser against Hoshea in this, that Hoshea refused any longer to pay the tribute imposed on the Israelites by Pul in the time of Menahem. But this opinion has been justly rejected by Maurer as unfounded, because xv. 19 speaks only of a single payment of Menahem to Pul, inasmuch as it is there written וַיִּתֵּן not וַיָּשֶׁב, as here and elsewhere, thus iii. 4; 2 Chr. xxvii. 5; Ps. lxxii. 10, where yearly tribute is intended. Maurer himself thinks that Shalmaneser came up, *aut ab Hoseae quodam aemulo in auxilium arcessitus, aut quia Hosea in appetendo regno Assyriorum praesidio ipse usus erat, sed voti compos factus conditionem, quacum erat regnum adeptus, omiserat.* This also is quite improbable and nowhere intimated. Why should we not seek the ground at once in the thirst of conquest of the Assyrians?— שַׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר, with which Gesen. compares the Pers. شرمان اَدر *verecundus erga ignem*, according to Hos. x. 14, where he is called שַׁלְמַן, devastated the fenced city בֵּית אַרְבֵאל, that is, the strongly fortified city Arbela in Galilee, known from 1 Macc. 9, 2, and Josephus (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 282), obviously in his here mentioned first expedition against the kingdom of the ten tribes, in which he made Hoshea subject (עֶבֶד) to him and compelled him to pay tribute (מִנְחָה, see above p. 54 f.) This expedition falls in the beginning of the reign of Hoshea; for he paid this tribute several years (שָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה v. 4), until he refused it, which took place in the sixth year of his reign, as Shalmaneser again appeared before Samaria in the beginning of the seventh year of it, v. 4.

Vv. 4—6. Hoshea sought help against the Assyrians in a treaty with the Egyptian king סוֹא (perhaps to be read סֵוֵא), that is, *Σεβεχός* in Manetho, the son of Sabakos of Ethiopian descent, the second king of the twenty-fifth dynasty, whom Rosselini thinks he has recognised in a royal figure at Thebes; comp. Vitr. *Comment. in Jes.* ii., p. 318, Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 596, and *thes.* ii. 940, Archinard, *chronol.* p. 68 and Häv.

Einl. ii. 2, p. 76.[1]—As soon as Shalmaneser learned Hoshea's defection, which is called קֶשֶׁר as rebellion against his acknowledged sovereign, in particular that he had sent messengers to the Egyptian king So and refused the farther payment of the tribute, he seized and laid him up bound in prison, over-ran his whole territory, advanced to Samaria his capital, besieged it three years, took it at length in the ninth year of Hoshea, and carried away Israel to Assyria and Media. According to this view of the history, which simply follows the text of vv. 4—6, Hoshea was already seized and imprisoned before the siege of Samaria. On the contrary, the difficulty is at once raised, how Shalmaneser could make himself master of his person before the taking of the capital, and then the question arises, where he left him bound. This question the expositors have not answered, but S. Schm. has obviated the difficulty by the assumption, that Shalmaneser fought a battle with him before the occupation of the country and the siege of the capital, and in it took him captive.

[1] Others, as Ussher, *Annal.* p. 52, Marsham, *Can. chron.* p. 485, take him to be Σαβακῶς (Herod. ii. c. 137 and 139) the first king of the Ethiopian race and father of Sevechos; but chronology decides against it. For as in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (Is. xxxvi. 1) Tirhakah advanced against Sennacherib, Sabakos cannot have been reigning in the third or fourth year of Hezekiah, inasmuch as Tirhakah's predecessor Sevechos reigned according to Euseb. twelve, according to Syncell. fourteen years; comp. Archin. *l. c.* p. 67.—Still less can So be identical with Ζήτ (of Manetho and Jul. Afric. in Syncell. i. 138 ed. Dind.) or Σεθὼς (Herod. ii. c. 141), as Hitzig on Is. p. 221 thinks to prove; because the names are too different. For the abbreviation affirmed by Hitzig of סוֹא from סוּת cannot be proved by the forms זֵה and זוֹ used for זֹאת, because (*a*) it is questionable whether these forms are to be taken with Ewald (Gr. § 446) and Hitzig for abbreviations of זֹאת and are not much rather independent forms, as Hupfeld in Lassen's Ztschr. ii. p. 431 f. supposes, and (*b*) because even if the former were the case, the ת in the present instance is an appended formative letter, the falling away of which cannot establish the presumed change of ת into א. The designation also of So as king of Egypt in comparison with Tirhakah, who, xix. 9, is styled king of Cush (Ethiopia), proves nothing for Sethos and against Sevechos, as the Ethiopian dynasty, to which Sevechos belonged, at all events ruled over a great part of Egypt. In fine, the other combinations of Hitzig in favour of his assumption may, in the great obscurity of the Egyptian history at this period, be opposed by other combinations of equal probability and weight, as has been done by Gesen. and Knobel on Is. xix.

As nothing of this is mentioned, however, many expositors, from R. Levi ben Gers. to Maurer, have supposed that Hoshea was only taken captive on the conquest of Samaria, whereby, moreover, it is not necessary to take וַיַּעַל (v. 5) as a pluperfect, as Maur. has shown. For *veri utique simlius est, Hoseam imminente hostili exercitu in Samariam se recepisse, Aegyptiorum fretum auxilio, quam Salmanassari obviam profectum in aperto campo cum eo conflixisse.* Maur. This supposition is certainly more probable, but whether it be therefore historically true cannot be decided on account of the brevity of the narrative. Budd. is therefore right also in saying, *ut ab ordine a scriptore sacro observato recedamus, nulla nos cogit necessitas (h. eccl.* ii. p. 418.) Whether, meanwhile, we decide for the former or the latter opinion, we must agree, that Hoshea after his capture was carried to Assyria, and there put in prison.—V. 5. The three years of the siege of Samaria were not full years, for, according to xviii. 9 f., it began in the seventh year of Hoshea, and the town was taken in the ninth, although is is there also said to have lasted *circa* three years. The ninth year of Hoshea corresponds with the sixth of Hezekiah (xviii. 10), or the year 722 or 721 B.C., in which the kingdom of the ten tribes was destroyed, see above p. 186.—"He carried them into captivity to Asshur," that is, into the land of Assyria; for he assigned them dwelling places in the lands of Assyria proper and in the cities of Media.[1] חַלַח is probably *Καλαχηνὴ* or *Καλαχανὴ* (in Ptolem. vi. 1 called *Καλακίνη*), the most north-western province of Assyria between the Tigris, the Armenian border mountain Niphates, and the

[1] Pul and Tiglath Pileser had already removed the transjordanic tribes of Israel (2 Ki. xv. 29) to Assyria, and indeed to Halah, Habor, Hara, and the river Gozan (1 Chr. v. 26.) This statement of Chron. deviates from our present one only in this, that Habor is distinguished as a country from the river Gozan and הֵרָא Hara is named in addition. הֵרָא probably denotes the Median highlands in the neighbourhood of the mountain Chaboras, the district of the Persian Irak, which the Arabs call الجبال *montanum*, the Persians كوهستان; comp. Boch. Phal. iii. 14, Rosenm. Althk. i. 1, p. 295, and Ges. *thes.* i. 392. Moreover, Gesen. *(thes.* i. 176) and Winer (R.W. i. p. 515) quite arbitrarily describe these deviations of Chron. from our verse as *negligentia rerumque geographicarum imperitia* of the writer of Chronicles, not reflecting, that the two passages speak of different deportations.

river Lycus, that is, the greater Zab (comp. Forbiger i. p. q. ii. p. 609, and, on the country along the greater Zab, Ritter's Erdk. ix. p. 639 ff.) So Bochart, *Phal.* iii. c. 14, Mich. *Supplem.* p. 767, Ges. *thes.* i. 476, Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 94, 113. On the contrary Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 98 f. and 120 takes חלח to be identical with the Syr. ܚܠܚܐ, ܚܘܠܐ, حلوان, a city, according to Abulf. in Busching's Magaz. iv. p. 262 and Assemanni (*bibl. or.* iii. 2, p. 418 f.), five days' journey north of Bagdad, from which probably the district bordering on the Zagros has received the name *Χαλωνῖτις* or *Καλωνῖτις* (see Forbig. p. 610 and 614.) It is scarcely possible to decide between these two places; only the identification of our חֲלַח and כֶּלַח the city of Assyria built by Nimrod (Gen. x. 11) by Ges. (*thes.* ii. 688), Tuch, Comm. on Gen. p. 239 and others, appears to me unfounded, and the distinction of the two by Mich. *l.c.* and Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 99 to be much rather established, while, however, it may certainly be questioned, whether חלח denotes Calachene and כלח Cholwan, Chalonitis, as Mich. thinks probable, or the contrary assumption of Rosenm. is more correct. On Cholwan, Holwan, comp. Ritter's Erdk. ix. p. 464 f. and 469 ff., who here p. 470 f. declares himself for the identity of חלח with Holwan.

חָבוֹר Chabor is (*a*) a mountain, the boundary range between Assyria and Media, *ὁ Χαβώρας τὸ ὄρος* in Ptol. vi. 1, a branch of the *montes Gordiaei* or *Carduchii* (see Wahl. anc. and mod. hither and central Asia i. p. 818 f.), which continues in a south-easterly direction from the south-east corner of lake Van to the south-west of lake Urumia, where, at the present day, in the district of the Hakary tribes, not far from the residence of the patriarch of the independent Nestorians, a mountain *Habor* is found (see The Nestorians, or the ten tribes, by Asahel Grant, translated by S. Preiswerk, Basle, 1843. p. 59); (*b*) a river still called Khabur, which, rising at the foot of this mountain above Julamerk, flows in a south-westerly direction to the Tigris, and first pointed out by A. Schultens (*ind. geogr. ad vit. Sal. s.v.*) from a passage of Jakuti also communicated by Mich. (*suppl.* p. 665), afterwards described by Wahl i. p. q. 718 and more exactly after the statements of Dr Rich and Dr Grant by Ritter (Erdk.

ix. p. 716 and 1030.) See also Grant, The Nestor. p. 40, and the map accompanying this work. This river flows through the middle of the province Kalachene. The word חָבוֹר only three times mentioned in the Old Testament, denotes, 1 Chr. v. 26, the mountain Chaboras, but in our verse, and the parallel passage xviii. 11, the river Khabur, as the term in apposition with it, river of Gozan, demands. On the contrary, Mich. (*Suppl.* p. 280 f.), Winer (R.W. i. p. 253), Ges. (*thes.* i. 442), Havern. (Comm. on Ez. p. 15) and others, also Ritter (Erdk. x. p. 248), understand חבור of the river Chaboras (in Ptol. *Χαβώρας*, in Strabo and others *Ἀβόρρας*, *Aboras*, in Plin. Chabura, in Abulf. and Edrisi خابور in the Syr. ܚܒܘܪ and ܟܒܘܪ), which rises under the Masian chain at Ras el Ain (راس العين), flows first through upper Mesopotamia in a south-easterly direction parallel to the two principal rivers, then turns to the south-west, and at Kerkesi, Circesium, Carchemish falls into the Euphrates (see Forb. i. p. q. p. 627.) But this river is called כְּבָר in Ezek. i. 3, iii. 15 etc. According to the analogy of the Syriac we might certainly take חבור and כבר only for different names of the same river, if only there were cogent reasons for this assumption. But these are wanting. The only plausible reason[1] is derived from the addition

[1] Hävern., indeed (Comm. on Ezek. p. 16 and 43) finds a proof also of the identity of כבר with our חבור in Ezek ii. 15, inasmuch as he so explains this verse: "And I came to the captives at Tel-abib, that dwelt by the river Chebar, and where they sat, there sat I seven days silent among them," as if it referred to earlier and later Israelitish settlers in this region, from which he then further infers, that colonists of the kingdom of the ten tribes had been already brought to this river. But it is manifest that this is not intended, according to the ordinary correct rendering of this verse, as we find it in the Chald., Syr., and Vulg. But even, according to the rendering preferred by Häv., "who settled at the river Chebar and dwelt there," the words imply no contrast of earlier Israelitish and later Jewish settlers, which is only imported by an arbitrary exposition of the words אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה יוֹשְׁבִים שָׁם, "who *already*, that is a long time before, dwelt there." Häv., indeed, thinks to justify the arbitrary insertion of "*already*" by a Syrian phrase quoted from Assemanni, but has not observed that in this the opposition is clearly enough indicated by the antithesis of the *praeter.* and the *partic. praes.*

נְהַר גּוֹזָן. The above named theologians, whom Ritter has followed, find Gozan in the district *Γαυζανῖτις*, situated, according to Ptol. v. 18, between the rivers Chaboras and Saccoras, now Kaushan, according to which the river of Gozan must no doubt be the Mesopotamian Chaboras. But, however much this opinion appears to be recommended by our finding here all the localities together (Ritter i. p. q.), yet grave objections to it arise on a closer consideration of the matter. In the first place the order, in which according to this view the places are named, must appear strange, Assyria, Mesopotamia and the cities of Media; why should the writer not have given the three provinces to which the Israelites were removed, according to their natural order as regarded from Palestine, Mesopotamia, Assyria, and Media? Why should he also have thought it necessary to add to חבור the more precise determination, river of Gozan, since the Chaboras falling into the Euphrates could have greater importance neither for him nor his reader than the land of Halah certainly still more unknown to the Israelites and Jews? Why should he not, as the exiles could only inhabit the land along the river, have rather named the country itself, and at most appended the river flowing through it as a farther determination of the country? Lastly, it is in the highest degree improbable, that the Assyrian should have transplanted the deported Israelites into dependent provinces.[1] The policy of these conquerors leads us rather to expect that Shalmaneser, as Pul and Tigiath Pileser (xv. 29, and 1 Chr. v. 26), transplanted the ten tribes not partly to Mesopotamia, but altogether to Assyria and Media, especially as only Assyria and the cities of Media are mentioned, and Assyria, where it is used in the Old Testament of a country, never occurs in the wider sense of the Greeks, as including Mesopotamia or Aram Naharaim (comp. on xxiii. 29.) Even Winer, although he finds חבור and גוזן in Mesopo-

[1] It is also probable, from political grounds, that the Israelites were transplanted into the centre of the Assyrian kingdom. A population that is carried away from its home on account of continued seditions, is not removed to a land bordering on other scarcely subjugated tribes, but is taken rather into the interior of the old country, where it cannot move without being under immediate inspection. Preiswerk on Grant's Nestor. p. 108, note.

tamia, cannot refrain from remarking, that "the Gozan of our passage points to Assyria, as that of xix. 12 to Mesopotamia" (R.W. i. p. 515.) But even in xix. 12 it is questionable, whether Gozan is to be sought in Mesopotamia; in our verse חבור נהר גוזן is certainly identical with خبور الخسنية *Chabur Chasaniae*, as Jakiti names the Assyrian Khabur in contradistinction to the Mesopotamian. For the same reason evidently נהר גוזן is here added to חבור, and גוזן denotes not Gauzanitis in Mesopotamia but an Assyrian district.[1] حسنية would indeed correspond still more to the Hebrew גוזן, if we read with Wahl. i. p. q. p. 718 according to a conjecture thrown out by Mich. (*suppl.* p. 666) جسنية, as ج and چ are frequently exchanged in the manuscripts; though this change is not absolutely necessary, as analogies also exist for the interchange of ג and چ (see Gesen. *thes.* i. 252.) The original signification of גוזן we cannot at present ascertain farther. But it is not impossible that the name Gozan is preserved in the word Zozan, by which, according to the testimony of Dr Grant, the Nestorians denote all highlands of Assyria, where they find pastures for their flocks (see Grant, the Nestor. p. 110), as the transition of *g* (ג) into *z* (צ) occurs in the Shem-

[1] Moreover, how far the similarity of the Hebrew גוזן with the Greek Γαυζαν is from affording a valid proof of its identity with the Mesopotamian district Γαυζανῖτις, may be inferred from this, that Ptolemaeus (vi. 2) also mentions a town of the name of Γαυζανία in Media between the chain of Chaboras and the Caspian Sea, which Boch. (Phal. iii. 14), Rennell (Geogr. of Herod. vol. i. p. 521, ed. 2) and Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 102 comp. with i. 1, p. 295) identify with Gozan, according to which the latter two find the river of Gozan in the Kizil-Ozien in the northern declivity of the Kurdish chain (the Zagros), which are called the Abbas Bei mountains, and flowing into the Caspian Sea (comp. Ritter's Erdk. viii. p. 615 f.) This assumption, which Ritter also, i. p. q. p. 590 thinks probable, although he afterwards (x. p. 248) declares himself against it, might at all events suit 1 Chr. v. 26, where the river of Gozan is distinguished from Habor, but is not necessary even there, and in no case entitles us to explain our passage according to it, as an earlier deportation is then spoken of. We take the river of Gozan, also in 1 Chr. v. 26, for the Assyrian Khabur, and do not identify the city Gauzania with Gozan, but merely regard it as a proof that the name Gauzan = Gozan occurred also out of Mesopotamia.

itic dialects (comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1144), but in Sanscrit *c'* (*ch, z*) passes according to definite euphonic laws regularly into *k* and farther into *g*, and in reduplicated forms inversely *k* and *g* into c' and g' (*j*).

Vv. 7—23. To the narrative of the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes and the removal of its inhabitants into exile, the author of our books appends some thoughts on the causes which brought this end on the greater portion of the covenant people, and finds them in the revolt of Israel from Jehovah his God, in his idolatry, in his disregard of the voice of the prophets by whom the Lord would have recalled the backsliders to himself, lastly in the separation of the ten tribes from the house of David by Jeroboam, and the worship of the calves introduced by him. These reflections rest altogether on the Mosaic law and the Pentateuch, so that they furnish a very strong testimony for its existence, not merely in the times of the author of our books, in the Babylonish exile, but also during the whole period of the subsistence of the kingdom of the ten tribes; indeed they have the Mosaic origin of the whole law for their postulate, inasmuch as only on this postulate could the revolt of the ten tribes and their continued opposition to the will of God revealed in the law and by the prophets be regarded and pronounced to be the sole cause of their final rejection from the presence of the Lord.—V. 7. וַיְהִי "and it came to pass," that is, the previously related fall of the kingdom together with the removal of its inhabitants took place, because . . . . In order to set forth more clearly the guilt of this apostasy, mention is made of the great goodness by which God had bound his people to thankfulness in the expression of a sincere and devoted worship, of their deliverance from Egypt, from the power of Pharaoh, as in the first commandment (Ex. xx. 2; Deut. v. 6), according to which sin is also described as a fearing of *other gods*. Comp. also Lev. xi. 45; Jos. xii. 17; Ps. lxxxi. 11; Jer. ii. 6, and on מִתַּחַת יַד פַּרְעֹה Ex. xviii. 10.—V. 8. The sin of Israel against his God is again described as "walking in the statutes of the Canaanites and of the kings of Israel whom they had made." These two kinds of sin are then more particularly developed in vv. 9—20 and 21—23. חֻקּוֹת הַגּוֹיִם וגו׳ form the antithesis to the חֻקּוֹת יְהוָה, in which Israel

was to walk, Lev. xviii. 4, 5, 26, xix. 19, 37, xx. 8, 22. In form the words agree most closely with Lev. xx. 23. The phrase הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הוֹרִישׁ וגו׳ often occurring in our books (1 Ki. xiv. 24, xxi. 26; 2 Ki. xvi. 3, xxi. 2) is from Deut. xi. 23 comp. xviii. 12.—"And of the kings, whom they had made," that is, the Lord their God had not chosen them, Deut. xvii. 15.—V. 9. וַיְחַפְּאוּ "the children of Israel *covered* words, with regard to which it was not so with Jehovah their God," that is, they ventured by a multitude of perversions and trifling interpretations of his word to conceal his true nature. Thus Hengstenb. (Beitr. ii. p. 176 and Christol. iii. p. 9) has rightly explained חפא, which most interpreters have so grievously misunderstood, that some have taken it for secret blasphemy against God (Chald., Syr., Grot., Cler.), others for committing acts of treachery (*perfide egerunt res quae non rectae erant in Jehovam.* Ges. *thes.* i. 505), others still, as Deres., for the commission of secret sins.—"And built them altars of high places in all their cities." The author of our books has indeed mentioned nothing of this in the history of this kingdom; but from the illegal calf-worship introduced by the kings it may be inferred, that the people also recklessly followed their inclinations in the erection of their own altars of the high places, which could not be entirely suppressed even in Judah, where the temple and temple-worship sanctioned by the Lord himself were still extant, though the altars at Dan and Bethel were also nothing but בָּמוֹת, 1 Ki. xii. 31. The words recurring in xviii. 8, "from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," are a proverbial description of universality, as much as to say, from the smallest town or hamlet to the greatest cities, in all places where men dwelt. מִגְדַּל נֹצְרִים is a tower built for the protection of the flocks in steppes and deserts, 2 Chr. xxvi. 10. On v. 10 comp. 1 Ki. xiv. 23.—V. 11. "They wrought wicked things to provoke Jehovah;" this refers to the sins of idolatry.—V. 12. גִּלּוּלִים (xxi. 21, xxiii. 24; 1 Ki. xv. 12, xxi. 26) is taken from Lev. xxvi. 30, and Deut. xxix. 16, and denotes not *stercorei, sordidi, impuri,* as the Rabb. explain it (see Ges. *thes.* i. 287), but first, stones, stone masses, as the Chald. גֻּלְלָא, Ezr. v. 8, vi. 4, and the Syr. ܓܠܠܐ *lapides,* Job viii.

17, the stones and stone masses dedicated to the gods, the stone images of the gods, lastly in a contemptuous sense the gods themselves. The original meaning is still evident in Lev. xxvi. 30, "I will destroy your high places, and cut down your sun pillars, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your גִּלֻּלִים dead stone masses;" the transition to the signification of gods is shown in Deut. xxix. 16, "and ye have seen their abominations and אֶת גִּלֻּלֵיהֶם their gods, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were with them." Besides these places of the Pentateuch the word occurs only in the passages quoted from our books and Jer. l. 2, and very frequently (forty times) in Ezekiel. Comp. Häv. on Ezek. p. 75 f.—The words, "whereof the Lord had said unto them, Ye shall not do this," allude to passages of the law, as Ex. xx. 2 ff., xxiii. 13; Lev. xxvi. 1, etc.—V. 13 ff. But the Lord did not rest satisfied with the law, but testified against Israel and Judah by all his prophets, and admonished them to turn from their evil ways and observe his commandments; nevertheless they hearkened not, hardened themselves as their fathers, rejected their commandments, the covenant and the testimony of the Lord, and went after vain idols to worship them. In v. 13 Judah is named with Israel, although here the causes of Israel's rejection only are unfolded, to intimate before hand the like fortune, that Judah also was preparing for himself although his rejection occurred only at a subsequent period, as is more distinctly expressed in vv. 19 and 20. בְּיַד כָּל־נְבִיאוֹ כָּל־חוֹזֶה "by all his prophets, every seer." כל חוזה is appended to כל נביאו, to express emphatically the whole of the prophets of every kind, whom the Lord had sent since the time of Moses. The emendation therefore proposed by Ew. Kr. Gr. 295 and Hitzig, Bgr. d. Krit. p. 127 כָּל־נָבִיא וְכָל־חוֹזֶה is unnecessary, although its sounds well on account of its easiness, comp. Maur. *ad h. l.*—V. 14. The words, וַיַּקְשׁוּ אֶת־עָרְפָּם, "they hardened their necks, were stiff-necked," are derived from Deut. x. 16, and formed after the phrase קְשֵׁה עֹרֶף, "of a hard neck, stiff-necked," (Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 5, xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 6—13, xxxi. 27).—V. 15. The phrase, "they went after vanity and became vain" (Jer. ii. 5) denotes the nullity of the whole life and strife with

respect to the chief end of man, his relation to God. All that man proposes except God as the object of his life is הֶבֶל (comp. Deut. xxxii. 21), is idolatry and leads to vanity, to spiritual and moral corruption, Rom. i. 21. The last words of the verse refer to Lev. xviii. 3.—In vv. 16 and 17 the idolatrous course of the Israelites, the worship of the calves, Asherah and Baal, and other superstitious practices, are likewise described with reference to the warnings of the Pentateuch against them. The golden calves (1 Ki. xii. 28) are called מַסֵּכָה after Ex. xxxii. 4, 8; Deut. ix. 12—17. On Asherah and Baal comp. 1 Ki. xvi. 32 f. —Of the worship of the whole host of heaven (sun, moon, and stars) nothing occurs in the *history* of the kingdom of the ten tribes; this worship is first mentioned as a historical fact under Manasseh (xxi. 3.) Our author has here merely borrowed the expression from Deut. iv. 19, and xvii. 3, without meaning thereby to indicate a new, though not previously mentioned, species of idolatry among the ten tribes, as the host of heaven was indeed implicitly worshipped in Baal and Asherah, as divinities of sidereal power; see on xxi. 3. The whole first half of v. 17 is formed after Deut. xviii. 10, where the worship of Molech is prohibited in conjunction with soothsaying and divination. Neither is there any mention of the worship of Molech in the history of the ten tribes; but it may still have appeared at least here and there in its closing period, when Ahaz introduced it also into Judah (xvi. 3.) קֶסֶם soothsaying, *μαντεία*. נְחָשׁ, which is used 1 Ki. xx. 33 in a tropical sense, comes from נָחָשׁ, a serpent, and means *omen ex serpentibus petere*, but is then used of divination in general. Comp. Boch. *Hieroz.* i. p. 20 ff., where the testimonies of the ancients concerning *ὀφιομαντεία* are collected, and Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bil. p. 122 f.—Concerning הִתְמַכֵּר see on 1 Ki. xxi. 20.—V. 18. "The tribe of Judah alone" means the kingdom of Judah, see above p. 171 ff.—Vv. 20 and 21 are a parenthetical explanation of the sentence, "he left only the tribe of Judah alone," namely, at that time, for afterwards Judah also was cast off, because he followed the statutes of Israel, comp. ch. xxiv. and xxv. כָּל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל all Israel of the twelve tribes, not merely the ten tribes as S. Schm., Calm., and others think. The כִּי (v. 21) is connected with v. 18,—the Lord cast off Israel,

only Judah remained, *for* Israel had rent (the kingdom) from the house of David, 1 Ki. 31, xii. 20.—וידא is to be read וַיַּדֵּא from נדא = נדד for ויד, "he made to flee, give way" that is, drew away Israel from the Lord. The *Keri* וַיַּדַּח gives the same sense, but is an unnecessary emendation.—V. 23. The removal (הֲסִיר) or rejection (הִשְׁלִיךְ v. 20) out of the sight of the Lord signifies the abolition of the relation of grace, into which the Lord had entered with Israel by his covenant, the withdrawal of his grace, the necessary consequence of which was the expulsion of the people from the Lord's land. This expulsion endured "unto this day," that is, until the composition of our books.[1]

[1] As the Hebrew עַד like the German *bis* (until) is not always used in an exclusive sense, but often also abstracted from that, which lies beyond the prescribed *terminus ad quem*, it by no means follows from the words, "The Lord removed Israel out of his sight . . . . . *until this day*," that the ten tribes returned to their native land after the time of the composition of our books about the middle of the sixth century B.C. Yet as little can the opposite widely spread opinion be established, namely, that they lived unto this day as a collective body in the exile. It is well known, how often men have wished to discover the ten tribes long regarded as lost, now in the numerous Jewish communities in the south of Arabia, now in India, particularly in Malabar, now in China, Turkestan, and Kashmir, or in Affghanistan, (see the proofs in Ritter's Erdk. x. p. 246), nay, in America, until recently Dr Grant (the Nestorians or the ten tribes) thought he had found them again in the independent Nestorians and Jews living among them; whereas others, as Witsius (Δεκάφ. c. iv. ff.), J. D. Mich. *(de exilio decem trib. comm.* iii.) and lastly Robinson in the treatise (the Nestorians, etc., New York, 1841) quoted by Ritter i. p. q. p. 285, and only thence known to me, endeavoured to prove, that they had been long since lost, partly by being mingled in the Babylonish exile with the Jews, and to some extent attached to the exiles brought back by Zerubbabel and Ezra to Palestine, partly afterwards by intermixture with the remaining Jews who were scattered over all the world after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and partly by conversion to Christianity, so that all attempts to discover any where the remainder of the ten tribes are vain. This view is correct, although its advocate has mixed its valid grounds with much that is untenable. For if we consider the arguments brought forward by Grant for his hypothesis, *(a)*, that we have not the slightest historical trace of the ten tribes having ever left Assyria, *(b)*, that they did not return with the return from the Babylonish captivity, *(c)*, that they were still found in the land of their exile according to Josephus (Antiq. xi. 5, 2) in

Vv. 24—41. *The Samaritans and their idolatry.* V. 24. After

the first, and according to Hieron. (Comm. on the proph.) in the fifth century, *(d)* and, lastly, that they were to this day in territory of the Old Assyria, inasmuch as the Nestorians as well by their own accounts as by those of the Jews dwelling there are Beni Israel, and no doubt of the ten tribes, as they prove themselves to be Israelites by still retaining several Mosaic customs and usages (the Nestor. p. 113 ff.); we find, that *(d)* only proves that the Nestorians are of Jewish extraction, but not they are remainder of the ten tribes, for their own accounts lose their weight from the fact that the Jews of other countries profess the same of themselves. Farther, the statements of Josephus and Hieron. *(c)* cannot be regarded as historically accredited testimonies, but are only conclusions built on the one hand upon the failure of distinct historical accounts of the return of the ten tribes, on the other hand upon the fact that in the times of these writers many Jews or Israelites lived in Assyria and Persia. So much also, and no more, follows from the saying from king Agrippa reported by Josephus *(de bell. Jud.* ii. 16, 4), not to build in the contemplative revolt on τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀδιαβηνῆς ὁμοφύλους and their aid. Lastly, with regard to the reasons *a* and *b*, the want of definite historical accounts concerning the return of the ten tribes cannot prove much as an *argumentum e silentio*, and is, moreover, weakened by the erroneous presupposition lying at the foundation of it, that the ten tribes never came into contact with the Jews carried away in the Babylonish exile, but remained unmingled and sequestered from them, and could not have returned, if not with Zerubbabel and Ezra, at a later period to their fatherland. The predictions quoted by Ritter, p. 250, probably after Robinson, Jer. l. 4, 5, 17, 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 11 ff., as well as the prophetic sentence cited by Witsius *l. c. c.* v. § 11—11; Is. xiv. 1; Mic. ii. 12; Jer. iii. 20, xxx. 3 f., xxxiii. 7 f., certainly prove very little for the contrary opinion, because they refer mostly to the Messianic times, and are to be understood in a spiritual sense; but from the books of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, thus much at least appears, that the Jews carried away by Nebuchadnezzar were scattered not merely in the province of Babylonia, but in the various districts of the Chaldean, formerly Assyrian, afterwards Persian kingdom beyond the Euphrates, whereby with the discontinuance of the distinction kept up by the policy of the kings of Israel the old separation also must have disappeared, and a closer bond have grown up among all the descendants of Jacob from their common unhappy lot of dispersion among the heathen; since the Persian kings could know no distinction between Israelites and Jews, and under Xerxes, the grand Vizier, Haman wished to destroy all the Jews (not merely the tribe of Judah, but all the Hebrews.) Farther the edicts of Cyrus, Ezr. i. 1—4, "whoever is among you of *all* his people, his God be with him, and let him go up," etc., and of Artaxerxes, Ezr. vii. 13, "whoever *of the people of Israel* in my realm is willing," gave permission to all Israelites of the twelve tribes to return to Palestine, and who could assert with reason, that none of the ten tribes availed themselves of this permission? If, on the contrary,

the removal of the Israelites, the king Assyria transplanted heathen colonists from several provinces of his kingdom into the cities of Samaria. By the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר most interpreters understand Shalmaneser, who removed the Israelites, because he only is

Grant remarks, that "of the 50,000, whom Cyrus sent back to their country, it is expressly said that they were of those "whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away to Babylon" (Ezr. ii. 1), with which we may also compare i. 5, "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites," etc., these words apply no doubt to the majority of the exiles who returned, and prove that the ten tribes did not return as a people to Palestine, but by no means that the great number of returning citizens of the former kingdom of Judah might not be accompanied with a considerable body of members of the remaining tribes; as Lightfoot *(hor. Hebr. in. ep.* i. *ad Cor. Addenda ad C.* 14; *Op.* ii. p. 929) and Witsius *l.c.* p. 346, and long before them the Rabb. in Seder Ol. rab. c. 29, p. 86, have concluded from the fact, that the sum of the persons and families separately named in Ezra ii. amounts only to 30,360 individuals, whereas the total number of those who returned is stated in v. 64 at 42,360, besides 7337 servants and maids, the inference, that this surplus above the families of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, mentioned by name, might have been of the ten tribes. To this it is added, that those who returned regard themselves as the representatives of the twelve tribes, inasmuch as at the dedication of the new temple they offer "a sin-offering for *all Israel according to the number of the twelve tribes*," Ezr. vi. 17. Those who returned with Ezra do the same thing. In thanksgiving for their happy return to their fatherland, they offer *twelve bullocks for all Israel*, ninety-six rams, seventy-seven lambs, and twelve he-goats for a sin-offering, all for a burnt-offering unto Jehovah, Ezr. viii. 35. Undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of those who returned with Zerubbabel and Ezra belonged to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, which is simply explained by the consideration, that these being a much shorter time in exile, had retained more faithfully the longing after the home given by the Lord to their fathers than the ten tribes who had been exiled 130 years. But that these also in the course of time, after those who returned to their ancient land had attained to greater ecclesiastical and civil prosperity, followed in great numbers, we must infer from this, that in the times of Christ and the apostles, Galilee and partly also Peraea were very densely peopled with Israelites; which population cannot be derived from the Jews who returned to Judaea under Zerubbabel and Ezra, because the Jews of Galilee were not regarded by those of Judæa as of equal birth, but more or less despised on account of their Galilæan origin. But those who remained in foreign countries were so intermingled afterwards with the Jews, who were scattered over all regions of the earth since the time of Alexander, and especially after the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth by the Romans, that the last traces of the old division of tribes have entirely disappeared.

mentioned in that which precedes. But according to Ezra iv. 2, Esarhaddon brought the heathen colonists into the country.[1] This statement it is sought indeed generally to reconcile with that presupposition by the assumption, that one part of the new colonists had been transplanted to Samaria by Shalmaneser, and another by Esarhaddon, whereby it is at the same time assumed, that Esarhaddon in this expedition removed the last remnant of the ten tribes, all who had escaped during Shalmaneser's invasion into the mountains or inaccessible retreats of the land, partly also no doubt into Judæa, and had assembled again into the land after the departure of the Assyrians (see Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 179.) But the following considerations are against this view; (*a.*) Our author does not compel us to understand Shalmaneser by the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, inasmuch as the introduction of the colonists into the land is not so closely connected with the removal of the Israelites from it, that both must have been effected by one and the same Assyrian king. (*b.*) Of a twofold transplanting of colonists to Samaria no indication is any where found, and as little of a second removal of the part of Israel that remained after Shalmaneser. The prediction Is. vii. 8, that within sixty-five years Ephraim shall be broken that it be no more a people, if it refer according to the supposition of Ussher, Hengstenb. (Christol. i. 2, p. 56 f.) and others to the transplanting of heathen colonists to Samaria by Esarhaddon, by no means requires a removal of the last remnant of the Israelites by this king, but only the occupation of the country by heathen settlers, with whom the small remainder of the Ephraimites intermingled, so that Ephraim ceased to be a people. For so long as the land of Israel was only desolate and bereaved of the greatest part of its Israelitish population, the possibility remained that the exiles might return to their fatherland, and with those who remained

[1] Kalkar has inaccurately examined this passage, if he (in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. iii. 3, p. 25) asserts, "from Ezr. iv. 2 we see only, that the Samaritans worshipped Jehovah since the time of Esarhaddon, not at all, that he led a colony to Samaria;" for the passage runs literally thus, "for we, as ye, seek your God, but we do not sacrifice to him since the days of Esarhaddon the king of Assyria, *who brought us up hither.*" They could not, they say, sacrifice to him hitherto, because they had no temple of Jehovah, on which account they now wish to take part in the building of the temple.

behind form again a people, and so long might Israel be still regarded as a people, as the Jews in the Babylonish exile did not cease to be a people, because they had the certain hope of returning to their own land after a seventy years' banishment. But after heathen colonists were settled in the country, with whom the Israelites remaining in the land amalgamated, so that a Samaritan mixed population of a predominantly heathen character grew up, a people of Ephraim could no longer be spoken of in the land of Israel. This settlement of the colonists in the cities of Samaria might therefore be described as the time of the total dissolution of the people of Ephraim without the necessity of assuming at the same time a removal of the last remnant of the Israelites, of which *history* knows nothing. This must certainly be assumed, if the ten tribes were removed to the last man, and the Samaritans were a purely heathen people without any admixture of Israelitish blood, as Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179, ii. p. 3 ff.), wished to show: but the inadequacy of this demonstration has been convincingly proved by Kalkar (the Samaritans a mixed people, in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. iii. 3 p. 24 ff.) By the מלך אשור accordingly we understand with Tremellius Esarhaddon, who transplanted the Samaritans according to their own account from Babylon, Cuthah, and other places, to Samaria, and are not afraid that the well-known mendacity of the Samaritans so strongly urged by Hengstenb. (Beitr. ii. p. 6 ff.) will be made good against this testimony, because the Samaritans, like all liars, only lied, when they hoped to gain some advantage by their lying. וַיָּבֵא, "and he brought," namely, men or settlers, from Babel, which was a province of the Assyrian empire, Cuthah, etc. The situation of Cuthah (כּוּתָה) cannot be determined with certainty. Josephus (Ant. ix. 14—3, and x. 9—7) explains it as a region of inner Persia, in which Zonaras, the Chron. Alex. and Cellarius agree with him; J. D. Mich. in the *spicil.* i. p. 104 f., as a district about Sidon, because the Samaritans, in a letter to Alexander the Great, say, that they were called Sidonians (comp. Jos. Ant. xi. 8—6, and vii. 5—5), but in the *Suppl. ad lex. Hebr.* p. 1255 f. he has rightly abandoned this opinion and decided rather for the كوثا كوثي, mentioned by Abulfeda and other Arabic and Persian writers in the Babylo-

nian Irak in the district of the Nahr Malcha, in which Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 29), and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 674) rightly agree with him, as this opinion has the greatest probability. Moreover, the greatest number of colonists must have come from Cutha, as the Samaritans are called כותיים by the Rabbins.—עַוָּה Avah is probably the same as עִוָּה Ivah (xviii. 34, xix. 13; Is. xxxiv. 13), as the conjecture forces itself on every one, that the Avites transplanted by Esarhaddon are those, whose kingdom was destroyed by the Assyrian kings (xviii. 34, xix. 13); but where the city or district Avah is to be sought is equally uncertain. Iken (*diss. phil. theol.* p. 152) compares the Phœnician city Avatha (comp. *Rel. Pal. ill.* p. 232 f.); and so Mich. (*Suppl.* p. 1851), because, according to v. 31, the Avites worshipped Nibhaz, by which idol he understands the great stone dog that stood formerly in the region between Berytus and Tripolis, and from which the Lycus received the name نهر كلب dog's river. This is very improbable, because the Assyrian policy could only hope to attain its end by transplanting the nations into distant, not contiguous localities. Ges. (on Is. i. p. 957) and Winer (R.W. i. p. 136) are of opinion that the city Avah is probably to be sought in Mesopotamia, but no trace of it remains either in the old writers or in the present oriental topography.[1] But might not Avah be identical with the city Awah or Abah (comp. Büsching's Magaz. v. p. 326), mentioned by Abulfeda in Persian Irak, lying twenty-seven parasangs north-east of Hamadan?—חֲמָת is the celebrated city Hamath on the Orontes, see above p. 134.—סְפַרְוַיִם Sepharvaim is probably the *Σιπφάρα* of Ptol. v. 18, the most southern city of Mesopotamia, perhaps the same as the *πόλις Σιπαρηνῶν* mentioned by Abydenus in *Eusebii. præp. ev.* ix. 41. Comp. Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1084 f., Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 152 f., Ges. *thes.* ii. 969, and Winer, R.W. ii. p.

[1] Hitzig in his comm. on Is. p. 425 explains עַוָּה as the earlier residence of the Nomade עַוִּים mentioned Deut. ii. 23, who dwelt before the Philistines unto Gaza, and seeks their home in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, as he supposes that these Avites migrated thence to Philistaea. But without any ground, as not a syllable is said in Deut. ii. 23 of an immigration of the עַוִּים.

526. On the other hand Vitringa and others sought the place in Syria, an assumption which is not demanded by its connexion with Hamath.—וַיֹּשֶׁב "and caused them to dwell in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel." From these words Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179) infers, that Esarhaddon removed the Israelites to the last man. But that these words must not be so strictly taken is evident from 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, according to which in Josiah's time a whole remnant of Israel (כָּל־שְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל) existed in the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, and even to Naphtali (2 Chr. xxxiv. 6), of whom the Levites had collected money for the repair of the temple. The words of our verse only prove, that the Israelites were henceforth no longer the principal inhabitants, the possessors of the land, but the colonists transplanted thither entered into their place as owners of the soil. But from this it no more follows, that an Israelite was not to be found in the land, than it follows, for example, from the words Jos. xi. 23, "So Joshua took the whole land according to all that Jehovah had said, and *Joshua gave it for an inheritance unto Israel*, according to their divisions by their tribes," that at that time all the Canaanites were extirpated, or at least driven out of their possessions.

Vv. 25—33. In the first period of their settlement in the cities of Samaria the new colonists were attacked by lions, wherein they recognized a judgment of the Deity of the land, whom they did not worship, and therefore petitioned the Assyrian king for an Israelitish priest, who might teach them the right worship of the God of the land. The king granted their request, and sent one of the exiled priests of Israel, who fixed his residence at Bethel, and instructed them in the worship of Jehovah.[1]

[1] Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179, ii. p. 13) urges also the petition of the heathen colonists as one of the chief reasons proving that the last remnant of Israel had been removed by Esarhaddon, as he concludes from it, that "they have no one in the land who can give them the rudest idea of the way and manner of worshipping the God of the land." But here two things are overlooked, *(a)* the priests were not = Israelites, that, therefore, the removal of all the inhabitants, even the lowest and most unimportant class of the ten tribes, does not follow from the removal of *all* the priests; *(b)* that the petition speaks of sending a priest, and not at all of communicating "only the rudest idea of the way and manner of worshipping the God of the land," that,

—From the theocratic point of view (comp. Lev. xxvi. 22; Jer.

according to the religious views of the heathen, a local deity can only be worshipped in a right manner by the priests consecrated to him, that only the offerings presented by his priests are acceptable to him, and adapted to appease his anger and avert the plague from the land. If it be objected, on the other hand, that the new settlers, according to v. 32, made priests from the whole people, this took place only after the arrival of the Israelitish priest, who could consecrate other priests. What Hengstenb. has farther adduced (to conclude at once the point in question) has still less force. The prophetic expressions concerning the expulsion of the ten tribes from their land, Jer. iii., xxx., xxxi., and Zech. x., prove by no means the removal of the last remnant of the people of Israel, but only the rejection and banishment of the people as a whole. The circumstance, also, that the Samaritans, Ezr. iv. 1, do not assert their Israelitish origin, will not surprise any one, who knows, that they did not become Israelites, because the heathen transplanted to Samaria were incoprorated with the remnant of Israelites in the land into a mixed populace, in which the prevailing heathen blood and heathen disposition had long entirely extinguished the Israelitish element. The remaining arguments drawn from Jesus Sir. and from the New Testament, are devoid of all force, see the refutation by Kalkar i. p. q. p. 30 ff. On the contrary, in favour of the mixed origin of the Samaritans is in the first place the analogy of all other deportations, in which only the mass of the populace as a body, particularly those classes of the inhabitants, from whom new seditions were to be apprehended, was removed, not to speak of the impossibility of getting hold of all the inhabitants to the last man in any country, especially a mountainous one (comp. Kalk. p. 28). Add to this the historical testimonies of Chronicles concerning a remnant of Israelites after the removal of the people. Among these is first 2 Chr. xxx., where the invitation sent by Hezekiah "to the escaped, that remained from the hand of the king of Assyria" in the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even unto Zebulon, to partake of the passover at Jerusalem, is mentioned. As according to Hengstenberg's own assumption, as well as our remarks on xviii. 3, this event belongs to the period after the deportation by Shalmaneser, and the whole Old Testament knows nothing of a second deportation, it furnishes a decided proof of an Israelitish remnant in the land. If it be sought to invalidate this argument by the affirmation of a second deportation after Shalmaneser, though destitute of all historical ground, yet it is impossible to set aside the similar fact related 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, that under Josiah, at least fifty years after the settlement of the colonists in the cities of Samaria by Esarhaddon, the Levites collected money for the repair of the temple from Manasseh and Ephraim and the whole remnant of Israel. And this fact, in conjunction with the other undertaking of the same king, namely, to search the houses in the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim, and Simeon even unto Naphtali, and destroy the high places, Astartes and idols (2 Chr. xxxiv. 6 comp. with 2 Ki. xxiii. 15—20), affords the most striking proof that there was a remnant of

xv. 3), the author of our books explains the plague of lions as a punishment from God. There were certainly lions in Palestine before this (Judg. xiv. 5; 1 Sam. xvii. 34 f.; 2 Sam. xxiii. 10; 1 Ki. xiii. 24, xx. 36), especially in the northern mountains (Song iv. 8; Jer. v. 6), in the woods (Jer. xii. 8; Am. iii. 4), and in the brushwood on the banks of the Jordan (Jer. xlix. 19, l. 44; Zech. xi. 3), although travellers have met with none in recent times (comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 104 and Win. R.W. ii. p. 37); but during the depopulation of the land from Shalmaneser to Esarhaddon they had encreased very much, so that they killed many of the settlers (וַיַּהַרְגוּ בָהֶם they killed of them, namely, many.)—V. 26. מִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ, "the right of the God of the land," that is, his right worship which he demands as due to him from the inhabitants; comp. on מִשְׁפָּט on i. 7.—V. 27. וְיֵלְכוּ וְיֵשְׁבוּ *eant et habitent, so. ipse et qui cum eo erunt, ejus socii, administri.* So correctly Maur., in opposition to Dathe and the exeg. Hdb., who would change the plural into the singular. The priest sent by Esarhaddon to the colonists was no Levitical priest of the Lord, but an Israelitish priest of the calves. This appears not only from the fact that he was one of the deported priests, and in Israel there were none but priests of the calves, but may also be inferred from the circumstance that he settled in Bethel, the chief seat of the calf-worship, and that his instruction in the fear of Jehovah had only the effect that the new inhabitants of the land, like Jeroboam I., made priests out of the whole people, and worshipped Jehovah in the high places built by the Israelites (1 Ki. xii. 31, xiii. 32), but at the same time adored each people its own gods according to the custom of the גּוֹיִם, that is, of the heathenishly disposed Israelites, who had been carried away thence (v. 32 f.) The שֹׁמְרוֹנִים (v. 29) are not the colonists transplanted to Samaria, as some expositors think, but the earlier inhabitants of the kingdom of Israel (שֹׁמְרוֹן see above p. 209), *Israelitae dum illi adhuc ibi erant* (Jarchi); for the שֹׁמְרוֹנִים are clearly distinguished from the colonists, who

Israelites in the land, even after the times of Esarhaddon, that was not removed, and that might and did mingle with the heathen settlers, as Ephraim and Manasseh belonged to the province of Samaria that was afterwards inhabited only by Samaritans.

made use of their high places. The words אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ הַשֹּׁמְרֹנִים are a parenthesis, and the following גּוֹי גּוֹי depend on יַנְיחוּ. Hence it follows that the Israelitish high-places still remained on the removal of the people, as nothing is said of a destruction of the cities on the conquest of the land by the Assyrians. Too much, however, would be attributed to the words, if they were to be interpreted so strictly as to imply that all the high places remained standing, and the new settlers had only used those previously existing and built none in addition to them.—The various gods of the heathen settlers named in vv. 30 and 31 are all of Babylonian or Assyrian origin, and are almost wholly unknown. Pfeiffer (*dub. vex.* p. 450) and Carpzov. (*Appar.* p. 516 ff.) have enumerated the opinions of the older expositors, especially the Rabbins. The Babylonians made for themselves סְכוֹת בְּנוֹת *tents of daughters*. Selden (*de diis Syr.* ii. c. 7, p. 283 ff.), Voss (theol. Gentil. ii. 22), Münter (Rel. d. Bab. p. 74), Winer (R.W. ii. 629), and others understand by this, tents or booths in which, according to the custom mentioned by Herod. (i. 199) and Strabo (xvi. p. 745), the maidens exposed themselves in honour of the Babylonian Mylitta (called *καμάραι* by Herod.); but to this A. Beyer in the *Addit. ad Seld.* p. 310 ff. and Carpz. *l.c.* have fairly objected, that according to the plain words of our verse gods or objects of idolatrous worship are intended, which were placed in the בית במות; comp. also Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 160. The Rabb. understand by it an idol, some the hen with her chickens, others the Pleiades or the constellation of the clucking hen (see Carpz. *l.c.*) On the contrary, Mov. (Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 596) renders סכות בנות *involucra* or *secreta mulierum*, and understands this of the idol of Mylitta, that is, the female organs of generation, which as symbols of the Babylonian goddess were kept in the sanctuaries wrapped up in robes woven for them (1 Ki. xxiii. 7) by the women or the young girls dedicated to her, who presented them as *Secreta Veneris* also to the paramours in return for the money given to Mylitta. But סכות בנות does not etymologically signify *secreta mulierum*. The סְכוֹת can only be *tabernacula (idolis sacra) in excelsis* (Ges. *thes.* ii. 952) or little tent-temples, which were regarded as holy and worshipped with the gods they

contained. This appears—altogether apart from the passage Amos v. 26, according to which the Israelites in their march through the wilderness bore סִכּוּת their king—partly from xxiii. 7, according to which the women wove for the Asherah, which is of the same nature with the Babylonian Mylitta, בָּתִּים houses, little temples, partly from Ezek. xvi. 16, where the Israelites are thus reproached, thou didst take of thy garments and didst make for thee variegated בָּמוֹת, that is, idol-temples made of patch-work. The addition בְּנוֹת, if it stand for בָּנוֹת daughters, cannot certainly be understood with Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 161 of the daughters of Bel and Mylitta, but is perhaps to be explained by this, that these little temples were dedicated pre-eminently to the daughters, inasmuch as Mylitta was especially honoured by these, namely, by the prostitution of their chastity.—The Cuthites made for themselves נֵרְגַל. Movers, p. 68, with the Rabbins imagines Nergal to be a cock; Selden (ii. *c.* 8) and Carpz. p. 517 explain the word *ignis perennis in septis a Cuthaeis religiosissime servatus*, after a quite uncertain etymology from נִיר = נר and גל from גלא. The moderns take Nergal to be the planet Mars, inasmuch as Winer (R.W. ii. p. 175) after Norberg (*Onom. cod. Nasar.* p. 105 f.) connects נרגל with نرسي, in Arab. مرّيخ, *Mars hasta et flagello munitus*; Ges. (*thes.* ii. 913) now prefers explaining it with P. v. Bohlen from the Sanscr. nrigal, *homines devorans*, against which the only objection is that nri certainly means *virum, hominem*, but gal signifies not *devorare*, but *labi, decidere, fluere*, and is perhaps etymologically connected with quall, quellen (see Bopp, *glossar. sancr.* p. 103 of the second ed.), and the signification *comedere* in Westergaard (*radic. ling. sancr.* p. 249), rests on the mere identification of gal with gri.[1] The men of Hamath made for

[1] Movers takes נרגל to be an abbreviated form of נרגל שַׂרְאֶצֶר, a name borne by two Babylonian grandees in Jer. xxxix. 3, of whom the one was a president of the Magi, and therefore probably had his name from the god, whose chief priest he was; שראצר signifies fire-prince and נרגל is, like נרגא, נריג, the hatchet or axe, which the Assyrian Mars had assigned to him as fire-prince (d. Relig. d. Phön. i. p. 341 f. and 423.)

themselves אֲשִׁימָא. Ashima was worshipped, according to Rabb. statements, under the form of a bald he-goat (see Selden ii. c. 9, Carpz. p. 518.) All other conjectures are still more uncertain, comp. A. Beyer *Addit.* p. 319, f., Ges. *thes.* i. 161, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 112.—The Avites worshipped נִבְחַז and תַּרְתָּק. The Rabb. derive the name נבחז from נָבַח *latrare* and explain Nibhaz to be an idol in the form of a dog (Selden ii. 9, and *Addit.* p. 321, Carpz. p. 518), with which Iken (*dissert.* i. p. 143 ff.) then connected the colossal figure of a dog, which, according to the testimony of the traveller de la Roque, is found in Syria, three days' journey from Berytus towards Tripolis, and was worshipped by the inhabitants of that region as a tutelary god (see on v. 24.) Winer (R.W. ii. p. 178), and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 842, and comm. on Is. ii. p. 348), incline rather to the assumption, that נבחז is an evil demon, the ܢܒܙ of the Zabians, which Norberg, who first started this opinion, describes in the *Onom. cod. Nas.* p. 100, as *horrendus rex infernalis : posito ipsius throno ad telluris i.e. lucis et caliginis confinium, sed imo acherontis fundo pedibus substrato,* with which the similar description of the Cod. Ad. ii. 50, lin. 12, given in the same place is to be compared. Tartak, which, according to the Rabb., must have had the form of an ass, (comp. Seld. and Carpz. ll. cc.), Ges. (Comm. on Is. ii. p. 348), and Winer (R.W. ii. p. 703), have also taken for a *cacodaemon,* whereby we might perhaps understand a planet of ill omen, Saturn or Mars, as the word in Pehlvi signifies deep darkness.—The settlers from Sepharvaim burned their children to Adrammelech and Anammelech. The sacrifices of children made to these gods indicate their relationship with Molech. According to the Rabbins, Adrammelech must have had the form of a mule or peacock, Anammelech of a horse or pheasant (see Seld. and Carpz. *ll. cc.*); but most probably these deities were also of an astrological nature. The name אַדְרַמֶּלֶךְ, which occurs also xix. 37, as the name of a man, is explained either from the Shemitic אדר, (glorious king), or from the Pers. آذر, اذر, (fire king), and understood of the sun. So Ges. Comm. on Is. ii. p. 347, after *Jurieu, hist. des cultes* iv. p. 653. Other conjectures of Lette see in the *Biblioth. Brem. nov. fasc.* i. No. 2.

עֲנַמֶּלֶךְ *Jurieu* would understand of the moon, but quite uncertainly. Hyde (*de relig. vett. Pers.* p. 131), explained the name much more probably of the constellation *Cepheus*, which in Oriental astronomy is called the shepherd, and the cattle (الراعي والغنم), and the herd-stars (كواكب الغرق), as ענם might correspond to the Arab. غنم = צאן. In his *thes.* ii. 1052, Ges. conjectures also, that ענם may be equal to صنم *statua*, and so signify *statua regis i.e. Molochi.* Finally Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 410), takes both names for one deity, a two-formed Molech, inasmuch as he asserts with right, that the *Kethibh* אלה ספרוים is to be read אל הספרוים the god of Sepharvaim, and explains this double god as a sun-god, because Sepharvaim, whose πολιοῦχος he was, is described by Berosus as a city of the sun. So far Movers is perhaps right, but his farther assumption is extremely precarious, that we "are to regard Adar-Melech as the sun-fire, and indeed, as Adar is Mars, in so far he was conceived to be a destructive power," and that Anammelech is a contraction of עין המלך *oculus Melechi*, signifying the ever watchful eye of Saturn, according to which Adrammelech is to be taken for the solar Mars, Anammelech for the solar Saturn.[1]

Vv. 34—41. This divine service compounded of the service of idols and of Jehovah the new inhabitants of the kingdom of the ten tribes retained unto this day, that is, till the time of the Babylonian exile, when our books were composed. In later times, as is known, the Samaritans abandoned idolatry and adopted

[1] Hitzig and Benfey have proposed still other but extremely doubtful explanations. Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 437), takes אדר to mean the month Adar, which originally denoted a deity, and ענמלך to be compounded of המלך and ען time = *Kronos*, according to which the two words coincide in meaning: "Adar the king, or Kronos the king," comp. on the contrary, Ges. *thes.* ii. 1052. Benfey (die Monatsnam. p. 187 f.) explains with Reland (diss. ii. 113), אדרמלך fire-king, and proposes to take ענמלך as an abbreviation of the Persian deity *Anahit*, or still better of the *Aniran* of Yezd, standing in the closest connexion with fire, in Zend *Anaghra* (lights) without beginning.

monotheism.[1]—V. 34. "They fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes or after their ordinances," that is, they have not purely retained either the worship of Jehovah or their former idolatry, but a compound of both. Naturally, therefore, they did not follow the law and commandments, which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, to whom he gave the name of Israel (Gen. xxxii. 29; 1 Ki. xviii. 31), and which required the sole worship of Jehovah with the exclusion of all other gods. On v. 35 f., comp. Ex. xx. 5, and the remarks on v. 7. בְּכֹחַ גָּדוֹל is found, Ex. xxxii. 11, and בִּזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה, Ex. vi. 6, xx. 33 f.; Deut. iv. 34, v. 15.—In the words אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב לָהֶם (v. 37) the written composition of the law through Moses is presupposed; for although the name of Moses is not mentioned, our author knows no other law than that given by Moses, comp. above p. 20 f.—V. 40. מִשְׁפָּט הָרִאשׁוֹן is the divine worship composed of idolatry and the external service of Jehovah, comp. v. 34.

[1] The reasons by which Hertz, i. p. q. p. 118 ff. wished to prove, that this section was written in the time of Josiah, and that the Samaritans had renounced idolatry at that time, and therefore before the Babylonian exile, are not cogent, as the words, v. 41, "they (these settlers) and their children, and their children's children (grand children) did as their fathers" must not be so strictly taken, that it could be inferred from them, that with the third generation, with the grandchildren, and therefore ninety years after the fall of the kingdom of Israel, the idolatry of the Samaritans ceased; altogether apart from the consideration, that this computation is antecedently false, because it supposes that Shalmaneser transplanted the new colonists to Samaria immediately after the removal of the Israelites. And from the fact that on petitioning to be allowed to take part in the building of the temple by Zerubbabel, they say to the Jews, "we seek your God, as ye," etc. (Ezr. iv. 2), it does not follow with certainty that they had at that time entirely renounced proper idolatry.

THIRD SECTION.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

In this period, which embraces an interval of 134 years from the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, 722 B.C. to the burning of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, 588 B.C. (see above p. 187), the kingdom of Judah is at the very first sorely pressed by the Assyrian Sennacherib, but at the entreaty of the pious king Hezekiah is miraculously delivered from this powerful enemy, xviii.—xx.; though in the fifty-seven years of the ungodly reigns of the idolatrous Manasseh and his son Amon, it is made ripe for its fall, xxi., which even the god-fearing Josiah, notwithstanding all his endeavours to extirpate idolatry and restore the true worship of Jehovah could not avert, but only delay for a time, xxii.—xxiii. 28. After this pious king had fallen in the unfortunate battle with Pharaoh Necho, the country was occupied by the Egyptians, his son Jehoahaz, who was made king by the people, was carried into Egypt by Necho after a reign of three months, and his brother Eliakim under the name of Jehoiakim appointed king, xxiii. 29—36. Under Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar, after he had defeated the Egyptian army of Necho at the Euphrates, invaded Judea, and in three campaigns, the latter two of which were occasioned by the revolt of the Jewish kings who had become his tributaries, made an end of the kingdom of Judah by the removal of the people to Bábel, and the repeated conquest and final destruction and burning of Jerusalem, xxiv. and xxv.

CHAPTER XVIII.

REIGN OF KING HEZEKIAH, V. 1—12. SENNACHERIB'S EXPEDITION AGAINST JUDAH AND JERUSALEM, V. 13—37.

V. 1—8. Beginning, duration, and spirit of the reign of Hezekiah. V. 1 f. "In the third year of Hoshea of Israel Hezekiah became king, and was twenty-five years old." As, according to vv. 9 and 10, the fourth and fifth years of Hezekiah correspond to the seventh and ninth of Hoshea, his first year appears to run parallel with the fourth of Hoshea. Josephus has, therefore (Ant. ix. 13—1), instead of the third year (v. 1) placed ἔτει τετάρτῳ, for which also Maur. has finally decided. But if we assume that the beginning of Hezekiah's reign falls in the end of Hoshea's third year, his fourth and sixth year must then coincide for the most part with the seventh and ninth of Hoshea, so that no change of the שָׁלֹשׁ in v. 1 is necessary. The age of Hezekiah at the commencement of his reign is surprising. For as his father Ahaz ascended the throne when twenty years old, and reigned only sixteen, if Hezekiah was twenty-five years old at his father's death, he must have been born in his eleventh year. This certainly implies a maturity in Ahaz earlier than is found in our northern climes. Many interpreters, therefore, presuming an error in the numbers, have supposed either that Hezekiah was not twenty-five (כה) but only twenty (כ) years old at his accession (Cler., d. exeg. Hdb., and others), or that Ahaz in the commencement of his reign was twenty-five and not twenty years of age, as the LXX., Syr. and Arab. actually read twenty-five years in 2 Chr. xxviii. 1 (Win. R.W. i., p. 45.) Both suppositions are possible, for in the latter case Ahaz would only be born in the fifteenth year of his father Jotham's life, which is not at all improbable, and may be sufficiently justified by the actual occurrence of similar mistakes in the statement of numbers; but they are not absolutely necessary, as instances of so early maturity are not wanting in southern countries. Sam. Bochart, in his *Epistola ad N. Carbonelli*, has quoted from Hieronymus (*ep. ad Vitalem* 132) and an old *glossa*, the cases

of a boy of ten years, and of one of nine, *qui nutricem suam gravidavit*, and several similar instances from later writers (*geogr. sacr.* p. 920 ff. *ed Lugd.*) Thevenot also remarks in his travels (part iii. p. 165), that among the Indians are found fathers of ten and mothers of eight years of age, and even lately K. Koch knew a young princess in Mingrelia, who in her tenth year was married to an Abkhasian prince in his twelfth year (see travels through Russia to the Caucasian Isthmus, part ii. in the Widenmann and Hauffschen Samml. von Reisen, part 26, p. 194.) —V. 3 ff. Hezekiah walked in the footsteps of his ancestor David in earnest devotedness to the Lord, in all confidence in him and sincere obedience to his commandments, inasmuch as he had been turned to the Lord his God on the one hand perhaps by the calamities, which the untheocratic reign of his ungodly father had brought on the kingdom, and on the other by the powerful influence of the prophet Isaiah. He therefore, in the very first year of his reign, reopened and purified the temple that had been defiled by the idolatrous practices of Ahaz and at length entirely closed, made atonement for the sins of the whole people by a sin-offering, and by a great burnt-offering renewed the worship of God in the temple, but afterwards summoned also the whole people, not merely his own subjects, but also the remnant that was left of the tribes of Israel, to a grand passover festival at Jerusalem in order to rekindle their love to the worship of the Lord, and finally destroyed all the monuments of idolatry in the whole land, and even to Ephraim and Manasseh, while he provided the temple-worship with the means necessary for its due administration, and arranged it throughout according to the law. All this is related at large in 2 Chr. xxix. 3—xxxi. 19, while our author contents himself with mentioning in a few words the extirpation of idolatry and the faithful observance of the law of Moses on the part of this king.[1]

[1] The attacks of De Wette (Beitr. i. p. 115) and Gramberg (die Glaubw. d. Chron. p. 185 ff.) on the credibility of these accounts of Chronicles, to which even Winer (R.W. i. p. 585) assented, have been already shown to be unfounded by Dahler (*de libr. Paral.* p. 131), von Hertz (i. p. q. p. 148 ff.), and in my apol. Vers. p. 399, while Winer has paid no attention to these replications. What Chronicles relates in detail of Hezekiah's efforts to restore and revive the worship of Jehovah, is only the historical enlargement of the brief and general

V. 4. On the מַצֵּבֹת, בָּמוֹת, and אֲשֵׁרָה, see above, p. 220 ff. אשרה is here obviously to be taken *collective*, as has been al-

statement of our author, that this king uniformly adhered to the Lord and kept his commandments given by Moses; for Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1 p. 22) very fairly remarks, "to the abrogated heathen worship, something positive, a purely theocratic worship, must be opposed." Yet the allusions of the prophet Isaiah xx. 30, and xxxi. 5, to which Häv. refers, I cannot recognise as proofs, partly because they do not point clearly enough to the great passover under Hezekiah mentioned in Chronicles, partly because they are not to be referred to this event, inasmuch as this prophecy of Isaiah was delivered before the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 139), while the solemn passover set on foot by Hezekiah was manifestly held after it. This follows clearly from the invitation to this festival sent to the residue of the ten tribes, in which, among other things, it is said, "ye children of Israel, turn to Jehovah, that he may turn to *you that are escaped, who remain from the hand of the king of Assyria;* and be not ye like your fathers and your brethren, who trespassed against Jehovah the God of your fathers, on which account he gave them up to desolation, as ye see; and be ye not stiffnecked, as your fathers, give the hand to Jehovah and enter into his sanctuary, which he hath sanctified for ever, and serve Jehovah your God, *that his kindled wrath may turn away from you; for if ye turn to Jehovah, your brethren and your children will find compassion before their conquerors, that they may return to this land,*" etc. (2 Chr. xxx. 6—9.) In these words the deportation of the greater part of the ten tribes is so plainly implied, that we cannot refer them to the deportation by Tiglath Pileser, which extended only to the transjordanic tribes and the Naphtalites, but not to Ephraim, Manasseh, and Zebulon, to whom the messengers of Hezekiah were sent with a letter of *this import.* On a cursory reading of 2 Chr. xxix. —xxxi. it might appear as if this passover were celebrated in the very first year of Hezekiah's reign, and for this reason, indeed, contrary to the law in the second month, because the first month was occupied with the necessary preparations (2 Chr. xxx. 2 f.) But this appearance vanishes on a closer inspection of these chapters. According to xxix. 3 Hezekiah in the first year of his reign, in the first month, opened the doors of the house of God and repaired them, then assembled the priests and Levites in order to charge them with the purification of the temple; whereupon they commenced the purification on the first day of the first month, and on the sixteenth day of the same month competed it (v. 17.) This purification begun on the first day of the first month cannot have taken place in the first, but at the earliest in the second year of Hezekiah's reign, because it was preceded by the repairing of the doors and the assembling and commissioning of the priests and Levites. After the purification was accomplished, the king, with the rulers of the city, offered a solemn sacrifice for the reconsecration of the temple, whereupon the congregation also presented burnt-offerings, and thus the service of the house of God was re-established. But the passover men-

ready remarked, p. 225 note. All the old versions have the plural, which 20 *codd.* in Kennicott also give. "And brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto these days the children of Israel had burnt incense to it, and it was called Nehushtan." This brazen serpent Moses had set up in the wilderness at the command of God as a symbol of the subduing and conquering of the serpents and their fatal bite, by which the people were visited (Num. xxi. 5—10, comp. Hav. Einl. i. 2 p. 502 f.) In after times the people inclined to superstition made this symbol an object of idolatrous veneration. For as Cleric. very truly remarks: *non est credibile a temporibus usque Mosis sine ulla intermissione cultum fuisse aenei serpentis simulacrum. Non videtur hoc passurus fuisse David uti nec Salomo primis regni sui annis. Sed potuerunt esse homines superstitiosi, qui interdum ad illud simulacrum suffitum adoleverint, quasi in honorem veri Dei,*

tioned after this in ch. xxx. must again have fallen in one of the following years. For if it had been intended to hold it in the second year of Hezekiah, after the purification and dedication of the temple was accomplished when the middle of the first month of this year was past, it could only have been stated as a reason for deferring the passover till the second month, "for the fourteenth day of the first month was already past," but not "for they could not keep it at that time (that is, in the first month appointed by law), because the priests had not sanctified themselves in sufficient time, neither had the people gathered themselves together to Jerusalem" (v. 3.) To this it is added that the assembling of the people, "from Beersheba even to Dan," could not be accomplished in two or three weeks, so that, if it had been designed to celebrate the passover in the same year, it would have been necessary to defer it not to the second but to a later month of the year. Hence it appears at least that the passover festival could not have taken place before the third year of Hezekiah. But in the fourth year Shalmaneser commenced warlike operations against the land of Israel, which continued for three years, during which a passover feast, to which the remnant of the ten tribes should be invited, is not to be thought of. Now if we add to what has been previously said, that the already noticed striking prominence given to the visitation brought upon the Israelites by the Assyrians in Hezekiah's letter of invitation implies, that the judgment of God that had come upon them was still fresh in the memories of those who had escaped it (which could not possibly be said of the deportation of the Gileadites and Naphtalites, twelve to fifteen years before, inasmuch as the tribes who had not felt the arms of Tiglath Pileser had unquestionably long since ceased to mourn over it), this passover festival cannot have occurred before, but must have taken place immediately after the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes, which appears also to be indicated in 2 Chr. xxxii 1.

qui jusserat Mosem id conflare; dein aucta etiam ut fit superstitione coluerint aut Deum Israelis sub ea imagine, aut quod deterius erat, peregrinum numen animo ei substituerint, atque simulacrum ejus Dei serpentem aeneum habuerint. This abuse was the more natural, as among the heathen, particularly the Egyptians and Phenicians, serpents were adored as the bearers of a healing virtue and of immortality; comp. Cler. on the passage and Creuzer, Symbol. i. p. 526 ff. of the 2nd ed. נְחֻשְׁתָּן formed from נְחֹשֶׁת brass signifies something brazen. Most of the older expositors think the name has the accessory idea of contempt. But this neither lies in the form nor is it probable in itself, because it must otherwise have been applied to the brazen serpent only at and after its destruction; comp. *Pfeiff. dub. vex.* p. 452.—V. 5. "And after him was not his like among all the kings of Judah, or among those that were before him." From the first of these expressions J. D. Mich. concluded that the author of our books took it from his source, which, according to 2 Chr. xxxii. 32, came from the hand of Isaiah, as king Josiah came to the sovereignty fifty-six years after Hezekiah, and was not inferior to him in piety and sincere obedience to the law (comp. xxii. 2.) But this conclusion is by no means certain, inasmuch as Josiah's conduct is described in the same terms in xxiii. 25, whence we perceive that this expression was of a proverbial nature *de eo quod rarissimum et cujus nulla memoria est*, comp. Cler. on Ex. x. 14.—V. 6. וַיִּדְבַּק בַּיהוָה comp. p. 165. V. 7. הִשְׂכִּיל wise acting, including its happy consequences, see above p. 21. "And he was rebellious against the king of Assyria, and was not (any more) subject to him." Judah was brought into dependence on Assyria by Ahaz, which Hezekiah resisted obviously only after the withdrawal of Shalmaneser from Palestine, perhaps only after his death, for which reason Sennacherib made war upon him in order to reduce Judah under his sway (v. 13 ff.) V. 8. "He smote the Philistines unto Gaza and its borders," etc., he thus punished them for their invasion of Judah under Ahaz, took from them the cities then conquered (2 Chr. xxviii. 18), and reduced them to their old boundary, Gaza. This statement, therefore, confirms the account of Chronicles, which has been assailed by neological criticism, which is besides proved

to be true by Is. xiv. 28—32, comp. our note on xvi. 16, and Hävern. Einl. ii. 1, p. 220, also Movers' Krit. Unters. p. 128, where, moreover, the following words, "from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," are erroneously explained of the cities founded by Uzziah in the territory of the Philistines, and the towers built for the protection of his flocks in the wilderness (2 Chr. xxvi. 6, 10), whereas this proverbial expression (comp. on xvii. 9) only affirms that Hezekiah smote all the stations of the Philistines from the smallest to the greatest and strongest.

In vv. 9—12 the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by Shalmaneser already narrated, xvii. 3—6, according to the annals of Israel, is repeated from the annals of the kingdom of Judah, in which it was also registered as an event of the highest importance for the theocracy.

From v. 13 to ch. xix. 37 follows the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah and his defeat, which is found almost word for word also in our collection of the prophecies of Isaiah, xxxvi. and xxxvii., and in a brief abstract, but notwithstanding its brevity furnishing several important supplements, in 2 Chr. xxxiii. These three accounts are independently of each other composed from the collection of the prophecies of Isaiah (2 Chr. xxxii. 32), which was embodied in the annals of the kingdom, as I have proved against Gesenius in my apol. Vers. p. 223—235, and as is now acknowledged by most critics and interpreters; comp. Ewald in the Leipziger A.L.Z. 1833 August, No. 188, p. 1502, Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 187, Hitzig, Umbreit, and Knobel on Is. xxxvi. and Hävern. Einl. ii. 3 p. 147 ff.

V. 13. Comp. Is. xxxvi. 1. "In the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, (714 B.C.), Sennacherib king of Assyria came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them." This verse forms the introduction to the following narrative, in which the occupation of the whole land by the Assyrians is summarily stated, wherein "all the fenced cities" is not to be taken in the strictest sense, as besides the strong capital Jerusalem, the fortresses of Lachish and Libnah (v. 17 and xix. 8) were not yet conquered, when the following negotiations with Hezekiah were opened. Sennacherib (סַנְחֵרִיב, in the LXX. Σενναχηρίβ or Σενναχηρίμ, in Joseph. Σεναχήριβος) mentioned also by Berosus

in *Josephi. Ant.* x. 1—4, and in *Euseb. Chron. arm.* p. 18 f., by Abydenus (in Eus. Chr. arm. p. 23), and by Herodotus ii. 141, the successor of Shalmaneser (see on xv. 19) reigned according to Berosus eighteen years in the time of Hezekiah, comp. still on xix. 37. The name סנחריב corresponds probably to the Sanscrit Senâgrib and the new Persian سنجي كريب *exercituum victor.* So according to P. v Bohlen, Ges. *thes.* ii. 962; otherwise Win., *lex. s.v.*, Hitzig and Ges. himself on Is. xxxvi. 1. Herodotus (*l.c.*) calls him *βασιλεὺς Ἀραβίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυριων*,[1] and says that his expedition was directed against Egypt, which also appears from xix. 24, is confirmed by Is. x. 24, and is besides easily reconciled with our narrative, as Judah formed the key to the conquest of Egypt for the Assyrian, as for all upper Asiatic conquerors, and had perhaps formally allied itself to Egypt, when Tirhakah marched against Sennacherib (xix. 9.)

V. 14—16. On the intelligence of Sennacherib's invasion Hezekiah at first made preparations for defence. He caused Jerusalem to be still more strongly fortified in case of a siege, and the fountains of the upper Gihon as well as the brook beside the city to be stopped (see on v. 17), in order to cut off the water from the besiegers, as is related in 2 Chr. xxxii. 2—8, and confirmed in the clearest manner by Is. xxii. 8—11, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 324, Häv. Einl. ii. 1, p. 221, and the expositors on Is. xxii. Meanwhile Sennacherib had penetrated to Lachish, whereupon Hezekiah, doubting the possibility of being able to resist his arms, sends messengers thither to treat with him concerning his submission, and actually sends the tribute demanded by Sennacherib, as is related in our verses. The fortress of Lachish lay seven Roman miles south of Eleutheropolis (see on xiv. 19), and therefore south west of Jerusalem on the way to Egypt. From the words of Hezekiah, "I have sinned, depart from me," etc., the older expositors infer, that Hezekiah sinned in his revolt from the Assyrian supremacy by refusing the farther payment of tribute; but as his predecessor Tiglath Pileser had

[1] This statement is explained perhaps in the simplest manner by the circumstance, that Arabia, taken in a wider sense, denotes all the provinces on this side of the Tigris, which the Assyrians governed in addition to their original country Assyria. Comp. Bochart *Phal.* i., c. 7, p. 31, and Schroeer *imper. Babyl.* p. 166.

brought the kingdom of Judah into dependence on himself only by dealing treacherously with Ahaz, the attempt of Hezekiah to shake off this yoke was scarcely to be blamed from a theocratic point of view. But Hezekiah certainly acted wrong in this respect, that after he had taken the first step he shrunk from its perilous consequences, and wished to purchase again the peace, which he himself had broken by new submission and payment of tribute. This false step of the pious king, arising from a momentary weakness of faith, was however turned into a blessing for him and his kingdom through the arrogance of Sennacherib and the covenant-faithfulness of the Lord.—V. 15 f. In order to make up the demanded tribute of 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold, as the treasures of the temple and the palace, having been very much exhausted under the bad government of Ahaz, did not suffice, Hezekiah was obliged to take the gold plating, with which he himself had overlaid the doors and posts of the temple (2 Chr. xxix. 3) and send it to the king of Assyria.[1] The substantive אֹמְנוֹת occurring only here etymologically *res sufficientes* denotes the door posts (סְקוֹפַיָּא, ܐܣܟܦܬܐ, اسكفات, *limina, superliminaria*, LXX., τὰ ἐστηριγμένα.)

V. 17. Not content with this payment of tribute, Sennacherib sent a strong body of troops under the command of Tartan, Rabsaris, and Rab-shakeh, from Lachish to Jerusalem, which posted itself on the west side of the city. In the text of Isaiah Rab-shakeh only is named, because he acted as spokesman in the following conference (see v. 19.) Tartan had probably the supreme command, as he is named first here, and, according to Is. xx. 1, also conducted the siege of Ashdod. Comp. the note on xv. 19. The name תַּרְתָּן, which, if we may conjecture from the other two names, is only a name of office or title, Gesen. and Hitzig on Is. xx. 1 explain by high person or crown of the body تارتن.—רַב־סָרִיס properly *princeps eunuchorum* (Ges. *thes.* ii. 973) and רַבְשָׁקֵה ܪܒ ܫܩܐ the chief cup-bearer are

[1] Οὐκ ἀπέχρων οἱ βασιλικοὶ θησαυροί· ἔθος οὖν ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀνάγκαις, καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς θησαυροὺς δαπανᾷν καὶ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων ἀναπληροῦν. ἡ ἀνάγκη δὲ παρεσκεύασε καὶ τὰς πύλας χωνεῦσαι τὰς χρυσᾶς, ἃς οὗτος κατεσκεύασε καὶ τοὺς σταθμοὺς τῶν θυρῶν. Theodoret.

names of office. There is therefore no ground for taking Rabshakeh with Theod. and Procop. for a Hebrew, who had either of his own accord gone over to the Assyrians, or had been carried thither with the captives. The supreme court officers at the same time filled the office of generals in the army. The following words וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ . . . וַיָּבֹאוּ are wanting in Isaiah, because they are unnecessary for the sense.—"The conduit of the upper pool by the highway of the fuller's field" (Is. vii. 3), is the conduit which went from the reservoir of the upper Gihon (Birket el Mamilla) to the lower pool, the Birket es Sultan (see above p. 11); as the end of this conduit is mentioned Is. vii. 3, which we cannot understand with Hitzig (Is. p. 75) of the end of the canal, which conducted the fountain to the pool, but only with Knobel (Is. p. 46) of the end of the conduit leading from the pool to the city. According to chap. xx. 20 and 2 Chr. xxxii. 30, Hezekiah stopped the upper mouth of the water of Gihon, and conducted it down from the west to the city, that is, he covered the conduit going from the upper Gihon to the lower pool, and so conducted the water, which formerly ran on the west side without the city walls down into the valley of Ben-hinnom, through a canal with several subterranean chambers into the city, whereby in case of a siege the water would be withdrawn from the enemy and preserved for the inhabitants of the city. This work, which is mentioned also by Jes. Sir. 48, 17, Hezekiah executed, but not, as Knob. p. 154 thinks, only after the departure of the Assyrians, but on their entrance into the country, before they appeared at Jerusalem, when he made the preparations for defence mentioned above in v. 14, to which belonged, according to 2 Chr. xxxii. 3 f., the stopping of the water fountains and of the brook by the city, and, according to Is. xxii. 11, the construction of a reservoir between the two walls for the water of the old pool, that is, the upper Gihon; against which the circumstance, that this work is mentioned in 2 Ki. xx. 20, 2 Chr. xxxii. 30, only at the end of Hezekiah's reign in the summary view of his celebrated deeds, proves nothing.[1]

[1] Comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 164 f., where reference is made to a similar precaution, which, according to Wilh. Tyr. viii. 7, the Mohammedans took on the first advance of the crusaders towards Jerusalem.

"The highway of the fuller's field" (Is. vii. 3), is the highway which either passed by the fuller's field or led to it. The first assumption is more probable, because the fuller's field, where the fullers, needing so much water for their business, cleansed and dried the cloths and stuffs, must have been in the neighbourhood of the upper pool, where a district had been assigned to them without the city, as the Roman fullers pursued their handicraft together without the city (comp. Martial. iv. 93, and Plaut. Asin. v. 2, 57) on account of the unpleasant smell (see Win. R.W. ii. p. 784.)

Vv. 18—25. (Is. v. 3—10.) Arrived at Jerusalem the Assyrian generals called for king Hezekiah to demand of him the surrender of the capital; but Hezekiah does not appear himself, but sends out his three chief ministers before the city walls, to whom Rab-shakeh addresses a boastful speech in order to intimidate Hezekiah and induce him to surrender. That they invite the king himself to the conference is omitted in the text of Isaiah. Eliakim the son of Hilkiah was only lately raised in Shebna's place, to be master of the house or minister of the royal court (עַל־הַבַּיִת comp. above p. 44), and in this office a father of his people (Is. xxii. 20 ff.) Comp. also on this office Paulsen d. Reg. d. Morgenl. p. 321.—Shebna (שֶׁבְנָה or שֶׁבְנָא in Is.) was formerly over the household, but was lately removed from this office on account of misconduct, as the prophet had announced to him (Is. xx. 15 ff.), though at the time still סֹפֵר secretary of the king or secretary of state (called among the Persians دوات *Devattar*, properly ink-horn bearer, among the Turks *Reis-el Kutteb*, head of the scribes; see Paulsen p. 292 and v. Hammer, Staatsverf. des Osman. Reichs. ii. p. 109, and on this office among the Hebrews our remarks in p. 43), whereas Isaiah had predicted to him banishment to a distant land.[1] Joah, the son

[1] As the name of Shebna's father is not given either here or in Is. xxii. 15, the expositors of Isaiah have not unfairly concluded that he was a *novus homo*, an upstart, who abused his high station of chief steward of the royal household for the enrichment of his house, drove in a splendid chariot, and wished to establish a name and memory for himself by the preparation of a highly finished family sepulchre (Is. xxii. 16), and was therefore dismissed from his office. On the other hand, the farther conjecture of Hitzig is altogether precarious, that he

of Asaph, was recorder, who kept the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים (see above p. 43.)—V. 19 ff. Rab-shakeh endeavours, in his address, to show that Hezekiah's confidence in his ability to resist the power of the Assyrians is vain, inasmuch as neither Egypt (v. 21) nor his God (v. 22) nor his military resources can protect him (v. 23.) The title of the great king, or king of kings (Ezek. xxvi. 7; Dan. ii. 36) was assumed by the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and other Oriental sovereigns, because not only many of their deputy governors of provinces bore the title of king, but also kings of conquered countries were under their supremacy as vassals, comp. Ges. Comm. on Is. i. p. 392. "What is this confidence that thou cherishest," that is, thy confidence that thou hast is a vain one. V. 20. אָמַרְתָּ is by general admission the original reading, and אָמַרְתִּי (Is. v. 5) a less suitable alteration.—"Thou sayest—only a word of the lips is counsel and strength for the war," that is, thou sayest, thou hast counsel and strength for the war, but this is only a vain pretence. So correctly Aben Ezra in *L. de Dieu ad h. l.* דְּבַר שְׂפָתַיִם is a word that comes only from the lips, not from the heart (לֵב), the seat of the understanding, and therefore an inconsiderate foolish speech (Prov. xiv. 23, comp. also Job xi. 2.) V. 21. "Egypt is a bruised reed, which, if a man lean on it, goes into the hand and pierces it." This figure is very significant of Egypt, inasmuch as the reed is there properly at home. Ezek. xxix. 6, 7, has borrowed this figure from our verse. קָנֶה רָצוּץ is not a broken, but only a bruised, crushed reed, which a man may take to be whole and so deceive himself, comp. Is. xlii. 3, where רָצַץ is opposed to שָׁבַר. What Rab-shakeh, arrogantly confiding in the invincible might of his master, here says of the vanity and ruinousness of trusting in Egypt, was literally true, and had already been very plainly stated by Isaiah (xxx. 3—5) to his people. The ו in וְהִנֵּה introduces the consequence.—V. 22. But besides Egypt, Judah had a strong shield of confidence, namely, the omnipotence of his God. This rock, also, which deceives no one who only

was perhaps a discontented Syrian, who had come from his country, which was subject to the Assyrians, to Jerusalem, and there counteracted the Assyrian interest.

puts his entire trust in it, Rab-shakeh wishes to shake, inasmuch as he artfully represents the reformation of religion effected by Hezekiah, and the destruction of the altars of high places, as an insult to the God of Israel. The Assyrians had thus heard of Hezekiah's reforms, and, according to their polytheistic notions, discovered therein an injury to the worship of God, which Rab-shakeh turns to his own ends in order to make the people waver in their confidence in the Lord. "If ye say, We trust in Jehovah our God (then I say) is not this he, that is, is not this the God, whose altars," etc.[1] V. 23 f. The last ground of Hezekiah's confidence appears to Rab-shakeh so insignificant and contemptible, that he offers him 2000 horses, if Hezekiah can only put riders on them. Here Gesen. fairly remarks, that the meaning is not that Hezekiah will not raise 2000 men, but 2000 men who could serve as horsemen. The Jews at that time had certainly cavalry, and attached much importance to them (Is. ii. 7, xxx. 16), but they could never be compared with the numerous cavalry of the Assyrian and Egyptian armies. הִתְעָרֵב to engage with any one, and hence here, "to enter into a contest" (Cler. and Gusset.) פַּחַת אֶחָד וגו׳ "one captain of the least of my master's servants," that is, one of the least captains of my master. פחה signifies in itself a deputy or lieutenant, usually the deputy governor of a province under the Satrap, but at the sametime, in military states a lieutenant-general of the army. The פחות are thus עַבְדִים קְטַנִּים. The interposition of אחד between the *nom. regens* in the *stat. constr.* and the noun depending on it is without a precedent, as by rule "no adjective, pronoun, or other word can come between the restricted

[1] The plur. תֹּאמְרוּן, by which these words are addressed to the people, appears at first sight preferable, but is in fact only an alteration of the original reading תֹּאמַר preserved in Isaiah, if thou sayest, namely, the king addressed in the person of his ambassadors, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 229. Farther, the assertion of Gesen. is false, that the author of Chronicles has quite mistaken the construction of our verse, inasmuch as this speech is repeated 2 Chr. xxxii. 12 in a contracted form, not verbally but according to the sense. Lastly, the inference of Knobel from the clause, "ye say to me," as to a previous conference of the delegates with Rab-shakeh, is also false.

and the restricting noun" (Ew. Gr. § 509), but we must conceive אחד as co-ordinate with, not subordinate to פַּחַת (Hitz.) V. 25. After Rab-shakeh thinks he has undermined every ground of Hezekiah's confidence, he comes to say also of his master, that he has not come against Jerusalem without Jehovah, but much rather by his commission. Rab-shakeh might have heard something of Isaiah's predictions of the sentence that was to be executed on Judah by the Assyrians, which turning to his purpose he so represents, as if his master had undertaken the campaign at the command of Jehovah. עַל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת (Is. v. 10) instead of עַל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה in our text owes its origin only to the tendency to assimilate the first sentence to the following one. המקום הזה is Jerusalem.

Vv. 26—28. (Is. v. 11—13.) The delegates of Hezekiah fear the boasting of Rab-shakeh might make some impression on the people, who were listening on the city walls: they therefore interrupt him, and request him to speak with them in Aramaic, as they understand that language; but Rab-shakeh replies, that his master had much rather commissioned him to address his speech to the people, and begins immediately in a still louder voice to urge the people to revolt from their king, and come over to the king of Assyria (v. 29 ff.) From these verses it appears that the Assyrian commanders understood Jewish or Hebrew, and the Jewish nobles on the other hand Aramaic. The mother tongue of Assyria was certainly not Aramaic, but a Medo-Persian dialect; but in all the parts of the Assyrian monarchy on this side of the Euphrates, in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, the Aramaic was the language of the country, which must therefore have been known also to the Assyrian government officers, and spoken also at court, if it was not actually the court language. יְהוּדִית signifies the native speech of the kingdom of Judah, and by no means implies a long interval after the captivity of the ten tribes, as Gesen. asserts. The change of the preposition הֲעַל אַדְנֶיךָ וְאֵלֶיךָ (v. 27) is removed in Is. (v. 12); the suffix in אֵלֶיךָ refers to Eliakim, the spokesman of the Jewish delegates. The עַל is also not exactly equivalent to אֶל, but includes the idea partly of elevation above the others, partly of hostility. By the words, "who sit on the walls to eat

their own excrement, and drink their own urine," Rab-shakeh describes the inhabitants as determined to endure a hard siege with an intimation of its horrors, comp. vi. 25. For חֲרֵיהֶם = חַרְאֵיהֶם *excrementa sua* and שֵׁינֵיהֶם *urinas suas* the Masor. have substituted the euphemisms צוֹאָתָם and מֵימֵי רַגְלֵיהֶם. V. 28. וַיַּעֲמֹד does not stand according to later speech usage for וַיָּקָם (Gesen., Hitz., and others); ויקם would here be quite unsuitable, because Rab-shakeh did not now for the first time stand up to speak, but was already standing, and had spoken; ויעמד means, he set himself, took a position designed for proper effect.

Vv. 29—33. (Is. 14—20). The address of Rab-shakeh to the people turns again on the thought, that Hezekiah can no more than his God defend Jerusalem from the power of the Assyrians; the people therefore should not allow themselves to be deceived by a vain confidence in him, but rather surrender immediately to the great king of Assyria, that they may enjoy a happy life under his sceptre. אַל־יַשִּׁיא, "let not Hezekiah deceive you," namely by the pretence, that he can defend the city against the assault of the Assyrians. The extraordinary phrase מִיָּדוֹ "out of his (the Assyrian's) hand," by which the speaker slips out of the speech begun in the name of his master, is omitted in Is. v. 14. V. 30. Concerning the use of אֶת with a passive see on vi. 5, and Ew. Gr. § 494 and 572. It is omitted in Is. v. 15. V. 31. עֲשׂוּ אִתִּי בְרָכָה, "make peace with me." ברכה blessing, happiness, is here according to later usage = the Chald. שַׁלְמָא peace; a signification, which is developed from the form of benediction שָׁלוֹם לָךְ. צְאוּ אֵלַי "come out to me," namely, from your walls, that is, surrender to me, comp. Ges. on Is. xxxvi. 16, where this phrase is supported by several passages from Bar Hebr. "To eat his own vine and his own fig-tree, and drink the water of his own well," means, to enjoy the fruits of his own property in rest and peace, comp. the analogous description of a life of undisturbed happiness, 1 Ki. v. 5 above, p. 57. The imperatives וְאִכְלוּ וּשְׁתוּ denote the consequence flowing of itself from that which precedes, com. Ew. Gr. § 618, "so will ye eat and drink." V. 32. "Till I come and take you," etc. In case of surrender also the Assyrian wishes to make use of his usual

policy of deportation into other countries. Comp. the examples, collected by Hengstenb. *de rebus Tyrior.* p. 51 f., of this measure, which was so often brought into operation in ancient times. But in order to reconcile the people to it, the boaster promises that Sennacherib will give them a land as good as their own. The description of this land (v. 32), which is abridged in Is. v. 17, as a land of corn and wine, bread and vineyards, olive trees and honey, is copied after the description of Canaan (Deut. viii. 8, xxxiii. 28), but not so as to presuppose a knowledge of these passages. Moreover, it is a vain labour, if the expositors (Hitz. Knob.) wished to discover the land according to this description, as Rab-shakeh in his boasting scarcely thought himself of any definite province of the Assyrian empire.—V. 33 ff. After representing to the people the delightfulness of the deportation, he returns to his principal argument, that even Jehovah cannot deliver Jerusalem from the Assyrian arms, as so many other gods had failed to deliver their countries. The regions enumerated, v. 34, occurred already, xvii. 24, as far as אַרְפָּד and הֲנַע, which, however, cannot be determined with certainty. Arpad (in Syr. ܐܪܦܰܕ) appears to have been a Syrian town, because it is always mentioned in conjunction with Hamath (xix. 13; Is. x. 9, xxxvi. 19, xxxvii. 13; Jer. xlix. 23), but cannot be farther indicated. Winer R.W. i. p. 103 has enumerated the altogether uncertain conjectures concerning it. Most after Büsching (see Ges. *thes.* i, 387), take Hena for the city عانة, mentioned by Abulf., on a ford of the Euphrates; comp. *Abulf. Mesop.* in Paulus' neu. Repert. iii. p. 33, and Assemanni *bibl. or.* iii. 2, p. 717.—Hitzig (on Is. p. 425) explains it by *lowland* from هنع *inflexit se, demisit* = كنع, connects it with Canaan, and understands by it a region of the Persian gulf, from which, according to Herodotus, the Phœnicians emigrated. Obviously false, as هنع to bow, be bent, crooked, stands in no logical connection with lowland. Comp. with this our remarks on the herewith connected explanation given by Hitzig of עִוָּה on xvii. 31.[1]

[1] The names הֲנַע וְעִוָּה are wanting here in the text of Isaiah for the same reason for which this text has been several times abridged they are here as genuine and essential to the completeness of the discourse as in xix. 13.

—V. 34. The words כִּי הִצִּילוּ, "that they had delivered," for which וְכִי הִצִּילוּ stand in Is. v. 19, depend on אֱלֹהֵי הַגּוֹיִם, inasmuch as the God of Samaria also is included under these.

Vv. 36, 37. The people kept silence at this speech, because Hezekiah had forbidden any answer, obviously in order not to irritate the enemy any more, or to provoke them to the immediate storming of Jerusalem; and the delegates returned with their clothes rent in token of their grief on account of the speech of Rab-shakeh which reviled not only their king, but at the same time and still more Jehovah to Hezekiah, reporting to him the substance of the speech. The עָם (v. 36) is quite in its place, inasmuch as the speech was addressed not merely to the king's advisers, but to the whole assembled people. Its omission in Is. v. 21 is therefore to be regarded as a change of the original composition.

CHAPTER XIX.

DELIVERY OF JERUSALEM AND LIBERATION OF JUDAH FROM THE ASSYRIANS. COMP. IS. XXXVII.

Vv. 1—4. After Hezekiah learned from his counsellors the speech of Rab-shakeh, he rent his clothes in horror at the daring mockery of God (v. 4), put on mourning garments as an external sign of the sorrow of his soul (comp. on 1 Ki. xxi. 27), and repaired to the temple, while he sent Eliakim and Shebna with the elders of the priests clad in mourning to the prophet Isaiah, to learn through him the answer of the Lord. *Ἀλλ' ὁ σοφώτατος βασιλεὺς οὐχ ὅπλα ταῖς ἐκείνου βλασφημίαις, ἀλλὰ προσευχὴν καὶ δάκρυα, καὶ σάκκον ἀντέταξε, καὶ τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν γενέσθαι πρεσβευτὴν ἠντιβόλησεν.* Theod. The position of the words, "Isaiah, the prophet, the son of Amoz," (v. 2), is unusual, (comp. xiv. 25, xx. 1; 1 Ki. xvi. 7; 2 Chr. xxvi. 22, etc.), and therefore changed in the narrative of Isaiah into "Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the prophet." V. 3, f. The delegates of the king beseech the prophet to intercede for the people still re-

maining, as the state was in a desperate condition and unable to help itself, and express the hope, that perhaps the Lord his God would hear the blasphemies, which Rab-shakeh uttered against the living God, that is, would observe and punish them. תּוֹכֵחָה Divine chastisement, נְאָצָה contempt, rejection of the people on the part of God, comp. נָאַץ in Deut. xxxii. 19; Jer. xiv. 21; Lam. ii. 6.—The expression borrowed from women in labour, "the children are come to the mouth of the womb, and there is not strength to bring forth," is used as a proverb to denote the highest danger, the most desperate condition and complete inability to help oneself. Hosea has a similar figure xiii. 13, and for a kindred proverb of the Arabs see Schultens *ad Job.* p. 31, and Ges. on Is. xxxvii. 3.—The designation of God as the living (חַי) stands with special emphasis in opposition to the heathen gods, which are only dead idols. וְהוֹכִיחַ according to Ges., Hitz., Knob. stands for וּלְהוֹכִיחַ "to revile;" but הוכיח never means to revile, or blame, find fault with, at least in the passages Gen. xxi. 25, and Ezek. iii. 26, quoted by Knobel, but only to admonish, correct, and cannot here be understood otherwise than תּוֹכֵחָה (v. 3); והוכיח is *praet. relat.* depending on the subject יְהוָה, "he will chastise him for the words, which Jehovah thy God hath heard." (Maur.) For this meaning of בְּ comp. xiv. 6, and Gen. xviii. 28.

Vv. 5—7. Isaiah answers in the name of the Lord, that Hezekiah is not to be afraid of the blasphemies he has heard from the young men of the king of Assyria, for the Lord will terrify him by a rumour, so that he will return to his own land, and cause him to fall there by the sword. נַעֲרֵי מֶלֶךְ the young men of the Assyrian king is a contemptuous designation of the Assyrian generals. רוּחַ means neither will nor sense, but the power of God operating on man and determining his spirit. Theod. has too narrow a view of it, *τὴν δειλίαν οἶμαι δηλοῦν.* שְׁמוּעָה is the report of the approach of Tirhakah, which Sennacherib very soon heard (v. 9.) The predicted death of Sennacherib also was accomplished (see v. 37.) But this prediction is not for that reason to be regarded as either a *vaticinium ex eventu* (Gesen.) or a mere presentiment of the politician Isaiah (Hitz. and Knob.),

for that at that time the plague had commenced in the Assyrian camp, as Knobel asserts, is a gratuitous assumption.

Vv. 8—13. Meanwhile Rab-shakeh had returned to his sovereign to Libnah, to which he had set out, probably after the taking of Lachish. Here Sennacherib heard the rumour of the approach of the Ethiopian sovereign Tirhakah, in hostile array, and therefore immediately made a second attempt, by sending messengers to Hezekiah with a letter (v. 14), to force the surrender of Jerusalem, inasmuch as he probably hoped, when in possession of this city, to be able to make head against the assaults of Tirhakah. Concerning Libnah comp. on viii. 22.—V. 9. אֶל תִּרְ׳, for which stands in Is. עַל תִּרְ׳, means in reference to Tir.—Tirhakah (תִּרְהָקָה, LXX. Θαρακά), is by general and unquestionably correct assumption, the Ταρακός of Manetho, the successor of Sevechos (xvii. 4), the third king of the twenty-fifth dynasty, and the Τεάρκων of Strabo (xv. 687), who reigned, according to Jul. Afric., in Syncell. (i. p. 39, ed. Dind.) eighteen years, according to Euseb. in Sync. (p. 140), twenty years, according to which Hitz. (Is. p. 222) fixes the period of his reign at 714—696, but Knobel, (Is. p. 127), at 717—696 B.C., comp. des Vignoles *chronol.* ii. p. 130 ff., and Archinard, *chronol.* p. 67 and 85. Although here designated king of Ethiopia, he ruled at the same time over Egypt, and is represented, like Sesostris, as one of the great conquerors of the old world, who penetrated to Europe and the pillars of Hercules (Strabo *l.c.*) But how far Tirhakah had already advanced cannot be determined from our verse. It was enough that this report was a motive to Sennacherib for effecting, if possible, the surrender of Jerusalem. Instead of וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּשְׁלַח, "he sent again" stands in Is. וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁלַח, "when he heard (this) he sent," which perhaps is more original than our text. As Rab-shakeh had effected nothing by his vainglorious speech, Sennacherib sent messengers with a letter, in which he only repeats what was brought forward by Rab-shakeh and merely enumerates still more of the lands conquered by the Assyrians than the former had named, in order to make a still stronger impression of the irresistible might of the Assyrian arms on Hezekiah. V. 11. לְהַחֲרִימָם properly to excommuni-

cate, to strike with a curse, comp. Num. xx. 3; Deut. ii. 34, iii. 6, etc., here in the general sense, "to destroy them."—וְאַתָּה תִּנָּצֵל, "and shalt thou be delivered?" a question implying a strong negative. V. 12. Gozan may here be Gauzanitis of Mesopotamia, but equally well a properly Assyrian province or district beyond the Tigris, as Gauzania (comp. on xvii. 6); for its collocation with Haran does not certainly warrant the presumption that the two places were contiguous, as the enumeration is historical, not geographical. חָרָן, حران, Χαῤῥάν (LXX.), Haran, from חָרַר to glow, scorch, as it were a dry scorched region (حران), an ancient city in the north west of Mesopotamia, in which Terah, Abraham's father, died (Gen. xi. 31), situated according to Abulf. in an arid region, which traded with Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 23), called by the Greeks and Romans *Κάῤῥαι*, *Carræ*, and celebrated for the defeat of Crassus in its vicinity, exists still according to Pococke, Beschr. d. Morgenl. ii. p. 235, and Niebuhr, Reise ii. p. 410, as a small place two days' journey southeast of Orfa under the old name. See the proofs in Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2, p. 149, Winer's R.W. i. p. 545, Ges. *thes.* i. 528, and Forbiger's Hdb. ii. p. 629. רֶצֶף Rezeph is the Arab. رصافة. Under this name Jakuti in his geogr. W.B. enumerates nine cities, of which the most celebrated was الرصافة or هشام رصافة, probably the same, that Ptolem. (v. 15) calls *Ῥησάφα*, in Palmyrene, on the way from Racca to Emesa, a day's journey west of the Euphrates. This is the place thought of by Mich. *Suppl.* p. 2264, Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 269, Win. R.W. ii. 381, and Ges. *thes.* iii. 1308; on the contrary Hitz. (Is. p. 424) understands by it another city of this name situated according to Abulf. in the district of Bagdad, because רצף by the omission of the particle את is separated from חרן and connected with the following בני עדן, a somewhat precarious argument, although the other assumption also rests on no decisive ground. בְּנֵי עֵדֶן "the sons, that is, inhabitants of Eden." עדן is perhaps not the Damascene Eden or Betheden (Am. i. 15), a city in a charming region on Lebanon, three

hours from Kanobin, called in Ptolem. v. 15 *Παράδεισος*, which still exists under the old name Eden (comp. Winer, R.W. i. p. 198, and Ges. *thes.* i. 195), but the Assyrian Eden, which is also named in Ezek. xxvii. 33, along with Haran and Calneh as an important place of trade. But this is not the Arabic عدن on the Indian Ocean (Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1840), but probably the tract صدن, which Assemanni (bibl. or ii. 224) places in Mesopotamia towards the Tigris in the present province of Diar-bekr (comp. Winer, R.W., i. p. 334, Ges. *thes.* ii. 995, Hitz. on Is., etc.)[1] תְּלַאשַׁר Telassar, Gesen., Win., and others take to be the same with אֶלָּסָר Ellasar (Gen. xiv. 1); but, first of all, this assumption is extremely uncertain (comp. Tuch on Gen. p. 72), and then Ellasar is likewise completely unknown. The phrase "the sons of Eden, who were in Telassar," is probably to be understood so that Telassar was a city or even the capital of the district of Eden.

Vv. 14—19. Hezekiah brings Sennacherib's letter into the temple and spreads it before the Lord, that he may observe and punish the taunts it contained. The spreading of the letter before the Lord in the temple, wherein unbelief can only think of the praying machine of the Tibetans (Ges. on Is. xxxvii. 14), is explained by that childlike confidence of faith, which feels itself impelled to utter in prayer all the concerns of the heart before the all-knowing God, although he as all-knowing sees and knows all things, before man presents them to him. סְפָרִים means not letters, but a letter, as *litteræ*; for Sennacherib had no occasion to write several letters on the same subject to Hezekiah. Hence also the singular suffix in וַיִּפְרְשֵׂהוּ, whereas יִקְרָאֵם standing nearer to סְפָרִים has a plural suffix, which is changed into יִקְרָאֵהוּ in Is. for the sake of uniformity.

[1] On the contrary Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 473 identifies Eden with the place of this name mentioned by *Stephan. s.v.* Ἀδανα on the Euphrates, inasmuch as he following Bochart (Phal. iv. 18) and Vitringa on Is. xxxviii. 12 takes תְּלַאשַׁר or תִּלְשַׁר to be the same with the city Thalatha mentioned by Ptolem. below the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris (see *Cellarii geogr. lib.* iii. *c.* 16, p. 641.) But this assumption is in the highest degree uncertain, although Telassar cannot be otherwise ascertained; comp. Mich. *Spicil.* i. p. 251 f.

How clear was Hezekiah's recognition of God is shown by his prayer (v. 15), in which he connects the condescending grace of the Lord who sits over the cherubim of the mercy-seat in the sublimest manner with his true Godhead and sovereignty over all kingdoms as creator of heaven and earth (comp. above 125.) In direct opposition to the fancy of the Assyrians he designates Jehovah the God of Israel as the only God, Lord and creator of the whole world. *Ἐκεῖνοί σε, φησὶν, ἕνα νομίζουσι τῶν πολλῶν τῶν οὐκ ὄντων· ἐγὼ δέ σε μόνον οἶδα θεὸν, ποιητὴν τῶν ἁπάντων.* Theod. Equally happy is the remark of the same father on the following words, "bow down thine ear and hear," *τὸ δέ κλῖνον καὶ ἄκουσον ἀνθρωπίνως τέθεικε, μετ' εὐμενείας δεχθῆναι τὴν ἱκετείαν ἀντιβολῶν.*—In v. 15 after יְהוָה stands in Is. צְבָאוֹת, which the prophets, especially Isaiah, frequently use, but which occurs in the historical writings only in the mouth of the prophets (see iii. 14, 1 Ki. xviii. 15.) On "אַתָּה הוּא וגו comp. Ew. Gr. § 548. The plur. עֵינֶיךָ in contrast with the sing. אָזְנְךָ is alone correct, inasmuch as the constant phrase, to incline the ear (Ps. xvii. 6, xxxi. 3, xlv. 11, and others, even in the plural, incline your ear, אָזְנֵכֶם Ps. lxxviii. 1; Is. lv. 3) and to open the eyes (Job xxvii. 19; Prov. xx. 13; Zech. xii. 4; Dan. ix. 18); because we always open both eyes to see anything, whereas one ear is inclined to the speaker. In the text of Is. stands עֵינֶךָ, which is perhaps also plural, only written *defective*, as 1 Ki. viii. 29; Job xiv. 3.—The suffix in אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ, which is wanting in Isaiah, belongs to אֲשֶׁר and refers as this to דִּבְרֵי, inasmuch as דברים has the singular meaning *speech*, "the speech, which Sennacherib has written in his letter." V. 17 ff. After Hezekiah has besought the Lord to regard, that is, resent the insults of his majesty on the part of Sennacherib, he mentions the fact, that the Assyrians devastated the nations and their lands, and burned their gods in the fire, but immediately adds in explanation of this, that these gods were not God, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone, and founds on this the petition, that the Lord would, by saving Judah from the hand of the Assyrians, show all the kingdoms of the earth, that he Jehovah was God alone. Instead of "הֶחֱרִיבוּ אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם וגו . . .

"the kings of Assyria have destroyed the nations and their lands," the text of Isaiah has, אֵת־כָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת וגו׳ "all the lands and their (own) land," obviously the more difficult and original reading, which our author has changed, in order to set aside the not so easily understood thought, that by making war on foreign lands they at the same time desolated their own land, that is, they depopulated and thereby desolated it with their continued wars. Ges., Hitz., Knob., and others, explain the deviation otherwise, but incorrectly, see my apol. Vers. p. 230. וְנָתַנּוּ also of our text is easier and more usual than וְנָתוֹן in Isaiah. The same holds good of the addition אֱלֹהִים after יְהוָה in v. 19, inasmuch as the use of Jehovah as predicate, "that thou art Jehovah alone" (comp. Neh. ix. 6) is rare, and therefore also was misunderstood by Gesen. ("that thou Jehovah alone art this, namely, that which is only falsely asserted of idols.")

V. 20 ff. When Hezekiah prayed to the Lord, Isaiah received a Divine revelation with respect to the prayer of the pious king. This word of the Lord, which the prophet sends, that is, causes to be presented to the king, contains three sections. In the first (vv. 21—28, in Is. vv. 22—29) Sennacherib is addressed; in the second (vv. 29—31, in Is. vv. 30—32), Hezekiah; in the third (vv. 32—34, in Is. vv. 33—35), the issue of the expedition of Sennacherib against Judah is announced in brief but very definite terms. In the very introduction (v. 20), according to our narrative the following prophecy is announced to king Hezekiah as the fruit of his prayer being heard. In Is. שָׁמַעְתִּי is wanting, so that the words, "What thou hast prayed to me in reference to Sennacherib," are to be connected with the following verse: "this is the word which Jehovah hath spoken concerning him." This was obviously the original text, and the author of our books has simplified the construction by the insertion of שמעתי, whereas Ges., according to his erroneous view of the mutual relation of the two narratives, asserts the contrary.

Vv. 21—24. The prediction begins with opposing to the haughty boasting of the Assyrian, the contempt and infamy which would befal him on his retreat from Judah without having effected his purpose. With the vivacity of poetry the language is addressed to Sennacherib himself. The virgin, the

daughter Zion, despises thee, derides thee; the daughter Jerusalem shaketh her head after thee. The phrase, daughter Zion, daughter Jerusalem, denotes not the inhabitants of Zion of Jerusalem, so that בַּת is put collectively for בָּנִים, as Ges., Hitz., Maur., Knob., think, but the city itself, with its inhabitants poetically personified as a daughter or virgin; and the *stat. constr.* בַּת־צִיּוֹן is to be understood according to the analogy of נְהַר־פְּרָת the river Euphrates (not of Euphrates); daughter Zion, not, daughter of Zion. So the *stat. constr.* בְּתוּלַת בַּת is to be taken simply in the sense of apposition, not of subordination; comp. Ew. Kr. Gr. p. 579. The daughter Zion is called בְּתוּלָה in reference to the Assyrian as a citadel inaccessible to him, not to be conquered by him. Comp. the illustrations of this figure collected from Arabic writers by Gesen. on Is. xxiii. 12. הֵנִיעַ רֹאשׁ, *κινεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν* (LXX.), to shake the head is among the Hebrews a gesture of scorn and vindictive exultation; comp. Ps. xxii. 8, cix. 25, Lam. ii. 15. אַחֲרֶיךָ after thee, that is, after thee retreating with disgrace.—Vv. 22—25. With his blasphemies, and his foolish boasting of his invincible might, Sennacherib had reviled the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. In v. 22 the reviling of Sennacherib is in the first place represented in a series of questions as a reviling of the Lord. וַתִּשָּׂא וגו׳ "and hast lifted up thine eyes on high against the Holy One of Israel," that is, not, thou hast directed thy proud glance against Jehovah (Gesen.); for רוּם עֵינַיִם height of eyes, = lofty eyes, is not proper here; מָרוֹם is the accusative of direction, comp. Is. xi. 26, and the phrase, to lift the eyes on high (to heaven), has not in itself, as the passage quoted proves, the secondary bad sense of haughtiness, but assumes it only in connection with עַל־קְדוֹשׁ יש״ *against* the Holy One of Israel, or merely through the context, as in Is., where אֶל קד״ stands for עַל־קד״. The designation of God, "the Holy One of Israel," that is, who manifests his holiness in and on Israel, belongs to the peculiarities of Isaiah's phraseology, and occurs in Is. twenty-seven times and only three times elsewhere in the whole Old Testa-

ment (Ps. lxxi. 22; lxxviii. 41; lxxxix. 19), as the passages Jer. l. 29 and li. 5, as acknowledged imitations of Isaiah, are not to be reckoned; comp. Kleinert, Echth. des Jes. i. p. 221.—In v. 23—25 it is more distinctly stated in what the reviling of the Lord consisted. In the supercilious boasting of his own all-grasping power, whereby Sennacherib, as Hab. i. 11 says of the Chaldeans, made his power to be his God. This boasting is in a strain of genuine poetry couched in a speech, in which Sennacherib declares that he can and will, with his warlike force, ascend the highest and most inaccessible mountains, destroy the most glorious creations of God, and rule over the earth according to his arbitrary will. But at the same time this individualizing of the general thought is put in the closest relation with Sennacherib's actually conceived plans of conquest in Canaan and Egypt, as the naming of Lebanon with its noble forests and of the river of Egypt clearly indicates. וְתֹאמַר "that thou saidst." By the Vau *relat.* the explanatory sentence is subordinated to the principal sentence in the form of an immediate consequence (Ew. Gr. § 611.) The words, "With my chariots upon chariots I ascended the height of the mountains, the utmost sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedars thereof and the choice cypresses thereof, and will come to the extreme lodging thereof, to the forest of its garden," are not to be taken with the exeg. Hdb. for a historical description of that which Sennacherib had already done or wished still to do, or with Gesen., Hitz., Knob., in a purely figurative sense for a poetical description of the otherwise frequent thought, "to go upon the heights of the earth," according to which the hewing down of the cedars would denote the fall of princes, kings, and warriors. Both are equally false. The words are an individualizing picture of the plans of conquest entertained by the Assyrian, in which Lebanon is named on the one hand as a mountain inaccessible to chariots, on the other as the northern barrier of the land of Canaan, by the conquest of which he would have made himself master of the country, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 201 f., and Delitsch, Hab. p. 94. So far then as Lebanon is put by synecdoche for the whole land, of which it formed the frontier, the hewing down of its cedars and cypresses, those glorious evidences of the creative power of God, denotes the devastation of

the whole land with all its glorious works of nature and art. בְּרֶכֶב רִכְבִּי, for which stands in the *Keri* and in Is. בְּרֹב רִכְבִּי, as the rarer diction, has the presumption of originality in its favour. ברכב רכבי "my chariots upon chariots" is a highly poetical designation of a countless multitude of chariots, as גּוֹב גּוֹבַי of a countless multitude of locusts (Nah. iii. 17.) The expression, "the height of the mountains," is enhanced by יַרְכְּתֵי לְבָנוֹן, "the utmost sides of Lebanon;" for Lebanon is the highest mountain of Palestine, and the utmost sides of it are its highest ridges, as יַרְכְּתֵי בוֹר (Is. xiv. 15, and Ezek. xxxii. 23) are the utmost depths of Sheol. קוֹמַת אַרְזָיו, the height of his cedars = his highest and most slender cedars. מִבְחוֹר בְּרוֹשָׁיו, the choice of his cypresses = his choicest cypresses. The form מִבְחוֹר stands here as in iii. 19 for מִבְחָר, but does not occur elsewhere. מְלוֹן קְצֵהוּ, "the lodge of its end," that is, the highest point of Lebanon, on which man can repose; and we are not to imagine with Cler., Vitr., and Rosenm., a determinate lodge built on the highest pinnacle of Lebanon. The מְלוֹן of our text is fairly taken in general to be more original than the מְרוֹם of Is. יַעַר כַּרְמְלוֹ its garden forest, כַּרְמֶל a garden-like plantation of trees, comp. Is. x. 18. By this is obviously to be understood the garden-like cedar forest, which stood on a small area between the highest summits at the present village Bsherreh, comp. above p. 65.—V. 24 refers to Sennacherib's intended expedition against Egypt, which was opposed by two mighty natural obstacles, the arid desert el Tih (comp. Herodot. iii. 5, and Rob. Pal. i. p. 296 f.), and the arms of the Nile which protect Egypt. These two obstacles the proud king imagines he can easily overcome. In the wilderness he digs and drinks strange water, and he dries up the rivers of Egypt with sole of his feet. The *praeter.* קָרְתִּי שָׁתִיתִי denote only that which is certain to come to pass, and are to be translated by the *praes.*; for Sennacherib had not yet entered the desert. By the epithet, *strange* water, it is indicated that the haughty sovereign intends to rule over the water in a foreign land as in his own, though it is so difficult to obtain in a wilderness. Even the arms of the Nile

are to dry up under the footsteps of his innumerable host. מָצוֹר here and in Is. xix. 6, Mic. vii. 12, denotes Egypt.[1]

Vv. 25—28. This boasting is very foolish, as Jehovah has long since decreed all this and now causes it to come to pass; and therefore the Assyrian, without being willing to know and acknowledge it, acts only as the instrument of the Lord, who has furnished him with power to destroy, who knows all his ways, and will soon restrain his rage against him, the true God.[2] The words, "from afar I have done it, from the days of old I have formed it," denote the Divine ordering and governing of all events, subsisting since the beginning of things, comp. Is. xxii. 11, xlvi. 11. The suffixes in יְצַרְתִּיהָ, אֶתֶּנָּה and הֲבִיאוֹתִיהָ refer to the following וּתְהִי לְהַשּׁוֹת, "that there be to destroy," that is, that fenced cities be destroyed into ruinous heaps. Many expositors, including Gesen., Knobel, and Hendewerk, regard תְּהִי as the second person; that thou shouldst be, tend, to destroy; but against this is on the one hand the reference of תְּהִי to the preceding suffixes, which require תְּהִי to be regarded as the third person, *gen. neutr.*, on the other the peculiar usage of Isaiah, in which הָיָה with an infinitive following is only a circumlocution for the passive, for example, הָיָה לְבָעֵר is to burn—will or ought to be burned, Is. v. 5, vi. 13, xliv. 15; comp. Kleinert,

[1] Herewith the expositors following Bochart (Hieroz. ii. lib. 5, c. 15 p. 766) very appropriately compare the similar boasting of Alaric in *Claudian de. bell. Geth. vs.* 526 *ss.*

. . . . *cum cesserit omnis*
Obsequiis natura meis? Subsidere nostris
Sub pedibus montes, arescere vidimus amnes

. . . . . .

V. 532: *Fregi Alpes, galeis Padum victricibus hausi.*

[2] Comp. as an actual parallel, Is. x. 5 ff. This prediction belongs without doubt to the first period of the Assyrian invasion, when Sennacherib advanced against Judah to take all the fenced cities. If the modern expositors of Isaiah, on account of a supposed difference, namely, that in Is. x. 28—34, the Assyrian army is to set out from the north to Jerusalem, but in our narrative from the south-west (xviii. 17), have placed this prediction in other times and referred it to other events, this could only happen under the supposition, that a prediction expressed in an individualizing picture is a chronological bulletin of the warlike operations of the Assyrian army.

Echth. des Jes. p. 275 f. That תְּהִי לַהֲשׁוֹת is to be explained according to this idiom, "there is to destroy = there are to be destroyed," is obvious, though it has not been observed by any of the recent expositors of Isaiah. On the form לַהֲשׁוֹת for לְהַשְׁאוֹת (*Keri* and in Is.) comp. Ges. Lehrgeb. p. 137.—V. 26 still depends on the foregoing. This also comes from Jehovah, that the inhabitants of the cities devoted to destruction are weak and frail, and can easily be conquered by the Assyrians. קְצַר־יָד short of hand, that is, powerless. The hand is the instrument of active power; the short-hand is therefore a figure of inability to deliver oneself, comp. Num. xi. 23; Is. l. 2, lix. 1. The opposite is *μακρόχειρ*, *longimanus*, that is, the mighty, the high and mighty, the well-known surname of Artaxerxes I. The comparison with the grass of the field, the green herb, denotes the frailty, the rapid withering away, Ps. xxxvii. 2, xc. 5 f.; Is. xl. 6 f. etc. חָצִיר גַּגּוֹת grass of the roofs, that sprouts forth on the floor of the roofs, and still sooner withers, because it can strike no deep roots, Ps. cxxix. 6. שְׁדֵפָה לִפְנֵי קָמָה "corn blasted before the stalk," that is, corn which is blasted and dries up, before it shoots up into stalks. For שְׁדֵפָה stands in Is. שְׁדֵמָה with a change of the labial, which is not to be confounded with שְׁדֵמָה *field*, but not *seed*, as Knobel thinks, see Delitsch, Habak. p. 197. In vv. 27 and 28 judgment is pronounced on Sennacherib. The Lord knows his ways and rage against him, and will therefore control him as an irrational animal, and lead him back to his country without having attained his object. The sitting and going in and out denote not merely the doing, but the collective doings of men; as the sitting and rising in Ps. cxxxix. 2. Instead of rising it is usual to say going in and out, Deut. xxviii. 6; Ps. cxxi. 8.—שַׁאֲנָן to be quiet (v. 28) denotes the security, that is conscious of its own strength, therefore the security of haughtiness, confident haughtiness—"and because (יַעַן is to be repeated) thy haughtiness is come to mine ears, I will put a ring in thy nose, a bridle in thy lips (mouth.)" The figurative expression is taken from wild animals, which men restrain in this way, the ring in the nose of lions (Ezek. xix. 4), and other wild beasts (Ezek. xxix. 4; Is.

xxx. 28), the bridle in the mouth of intractable horses (Ps. xxxii. 9.) "To turn any one back by the way by which he came," means to send him back disappointed in his object.

Vv. 29—31. This sentence concerning the end of the undertakings of Sennacherib is more fully particularized in the last section of our prediction, first, however, in the second section (vv. 29—31) a sign is given to Hezekiah for the confirmation of its truth. The אוֹת, *σημεῖον* is here no miracle, no מוֹפֵת as 1 Ki. xiii. 3, but consists in the foretelling of natural and nearer events, which serve to accredit the proper prediction, on the contrary Is. viii. 14, in the presaging of a supernatural event, which, while connected with the expectation of the people, was given for the confirmation of a prophecy more difficult to be believed when the view was directed only to the visible state of present things. The purport of the sign is, that this and the next year the country will be still occupied by the enemies, so that men cannot ordinarily sow and reap, but must live on that which grows without sowing; but in the third year they will again be able to cultivate their fields and vineyards, and reap as usual. The *infin. absol.* אָכוֹל stands not for the perfect, but for the imperative, as the following imperatives show, comp. Ew. Gr. § 583.— סָפִיחַ new growth, after growth (from סָפַח-סָפָה to add, annex,[1] properly what is added to that which is already gained in the previous harvest, comp. Delitsch, Hab. p. 88) denotes the corn which comes up from the dropped seed of the previous year, Lev. xxv. 5—11. סָחִישׁ or with transposition of the letters שָׁחִיס in Is. Abulwal. explains, "that which germinates from the root of the seed." The etymology of the word is uncertain, it cannot therefore be determined which form the original and which is the transposed.[2] V. 30 f. The remnant that is escaped

[1] The current explanation of סָפִיחַ from سفح *effudit, effusum*, "that which grows from the dropped grains of the previous harvest," is proved to be inadmissible by Lev. xxv. 11.

[2] Neither the Arabic سخص *elata est (vox), sustulit (visum) in cœlum*, which Ges. compares in *lex.*, nor شخس, *dispersus, dissipatus est*, which Winer in *lex.* proposes, presents a suitable meaning, and the old writers only conjectured from the context and fluctuated (comp.

of the house of Judah will again grow and flourish, for out of Jerusalem will go forth a remnant that has escaped. The theocratic people will not be exterminated by this judgment, but only winnowed through the jealousy of the Lord, who cannot utterly cast off his chosen people and leave them to perish by the heathen. פְּלֵיטָה denotes those who have escaped destruction in the judgment, Is. iv. 2, x. 20. The deliverance is connected with Jerusalem and Mount Zion, from which, according to Is. ii. 3, the salvation of the Messiah is to go forth, and is based upon the קִנְאַת יְהוָה, as in Is. ix. 6, the appearance of the Messiah for the establishment of the eternal kingdom of peace and righteousness. For the deliverance of the covenant-people from the power of the Assyrians, is a type of the deliverance of the people of God from the bondage of sin and death through the Messiah. קנאת יהוה, is the jealousy of Jehovah's love, which cannot altogether and for ever reject his betrothed and confiding people. Comp. the remarks on קָנָא p. 210. After יהוה the צבאות, which is quite in keeping with the phraseology of Isaiah (Is. v. 22), is omitted in our text, comp. Is. ix. 6.

Vv. 32—34. After this sign given to Hezekiah, the prophecy returns to Sennacherib, announcing that he will not come to Jerusalem, besiege or shoot against it, but return without having effected his purpose, because the Lord defends it to save it for the sake of his promise.[1] קִדֵּם with double accus. means to come to meet any one with anything, sometimes *sensu bono*, for ex. Ps. xxi. 4, sometimes *hostili modo*, as here, with shield to advance against (the city.) V. 34. "For mine own sake and for my servant David's sake," that is, because Jehovah as the covenant-God, unchangeable in his engagements, must perform his promise made to David, comp. the remarks on 1 Ki. xi. 13, above p. 171.

Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1739 f.) J. Fürst (Concord. p. 762 f.) takes חָשׁ to be the root, which has *vim status exsucculenti, aridi atque serotini*, and explains סָחִישׁ *planta serotina quae tempore succositatis praeterito germinat*, an aftershoot.

[1] The reasons for which Hitz. and Hendew. wish to refuse these verses to Isaiah, have been already rejected as inconclusive by Knobel.

Vv. 35—37. In v. 35, f., the historical fulfilment is immediately annexed to the prediction, although, in reality, about two years intervened in order to conclude the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion with this chapter. There is a difficulty in the expression וַיְהִי בַלַּיְלָה הַהוּא, "and it came to pass that night," because no night is mentioned in the preceding context, to which הַהוּא might refer. The whole particulars can only refer to the time when Sennacherib advanced to Jerusalem to commence the siege, for this is the point of time given in the verses immediately before, which is to be placed about two years after that prediction of the prophet, or, which is the same thing, after the sending of the messengers of Sennacherib, mentioned in v. 9, ff., to summon Hezekiah to surrender Jerusalem.[1] מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, "the angel of the Lord," is the same, who as מַשְׁחִית, "the

[1] Most of the old interpreters erroneously understand בַלַּיְלָה הַהוּא of the night, which followed the day in which Isaiah delivered his prophecy, with which they reconcile the determination of time in the sign given to Hezekiah (v. 29), by the aid of a sabbatical year, which Scaliger places in the thirteenth, most others in the fifteenth or sixteenth year of Hezekiah's reign (comp. Vitr. *ad Jes.* xxxvii. 30), or even by the assumption of a sabbatical year followed by a jubilee year (see J. Ode *de anno Hebr. jubil.* in Oelrich's *collectio opusc. hist. phil. theol.* ii. p. 461, 484), while Hitzig, who thus understands בלילה הההוא, offers no explanation. This assumption is opposed not only by the want of any allusion to the sabbatical or jubilee year in either text, but also by the circumstance, that the sentence of the prophet, "this year and the following sabbatical year (or in this sabbatical and the following jubilee year), ye will live on that which grows without sowing, but in the third year again ye will be able to sow and reap," could scarcely be a sign given by God for the satisfaction of Hezekiah, as it left him entirely uncertain whether the present severe oppression on the part of the Assyrians would cease immediately or only after two years. Equally inadmissible is the expedient, by which Gesen. proposed to obviate the difficulties, that is, to take the *infin. abs.* אָכוֹל (v. 29), as *praeter.*, and so determine the sense of the verse thus, "Two years has the land now been wasted by the enemy, so that there was neither sowing nor reaping, in this third year delivered from the enemy ye will again sow and reap." For that אָכוֹל cannot here be understood of the past, was already remarked on v. 29, and that בַּשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁלִשִׁית cannot mean, in this third, that is, in the present year, does not require to be remarked.

destroying angel," smote the first-born of the Egyptians (Ex. xiii. 23, comp. with vv. 12, 13), and after the enumeration of the people in David's time, inflicted the punishment of pestilence on Israel (2 Sam. xxiv. 16), from whom proceed as well the preservation and protection of the true members of the theocracy as the destruction of all their enemies, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 202 f. The means which he employed for the destruction of the Assyrian host, was most probably a fearfully violent pestilence, as in David's time (2 Sam. xxiv. 13, 15 f.), and perhaps also in the death of the first-born, comp. Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 126 ff.[1] וַיַּשְׁכִּימוּ וְגוֹ׳ "and when they (*sc. pauci qui reliqui erant*, J. H. Mich., to whom belonged the king himself), arose in the morning, behold they were all (the 185,000 men), dead corpses." פְּגָרִים "lifeless bodies," is used of the bodies of men as well as animals. According to Hengstenb. (Christol. iii. p. 597), it properly stands only for animal bodies,

[1] As the plague often carried away several thousand men in one day, but in no other account were 185,000 men killed by it in one night, Gesen., Hitz., Knobel, and others, who think of nothing more than a natural plague, pronounce partly the statement, "in one night," which is also implied in the parallel narrative of Isaiah, although it has not בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא, partly the number of the slain to be a mythical exaggeration, in reply to which Hendew. thinks that no one will consider the number mythical, who has any historical knowledge of the frightful ravages which the plague makes, and is aware that for example in 1714, it swept away 300,000 men in Constantinople, and often carries off 30,000 in Smyrna (Jahn's Archæol. i. 2, p. 392), while in an army stationed in a hostile country, it might easily effect a still more extensive desolation. This defence of the historical truth of our narrative is still weaker than the attack upon it, as the expositors, whom Hendew. opposes, have quoted before him the self-same fact, from Jahn's Archæol. But according to the express statement of our narrative the destruction of the Assyrian army was no mere natural consequence of a plague breaking out in the country, but a Divine judgment executed by the angel of the Lord, which is not to be measured by the rationalistic standard of an ordinary plague, even if the plague was the means by which the army of the proud Sennacherib was destroyed. There is great probability in the opinion of Vitringa on Is. xxxvii. 36, *in tempestate horribili ab Angelo excitata haec hominum millia prostrata esse fulmine, corporibus intus adustis, vestibus salvis.*—The various natural explanations of the miracle, for example, by the poisonous simoom, by an earthquake, by a nocturnal attack of Tirhakah, by the poisoning of the water and the provisions, and the

but is afterwards transferred to the bodies of those, who by their wickedness have incurred the Divine judgment and been destroyed by it.[1] V. 36. The accumulation of the verbs וַיִּסַּע וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיָּשָׁב "departed and went and returned," expresses the haste with which Sennacherib departed. Nineveh נִינְוֵה, that is, dwelling of Ninus, called by the Greeks and Romans *Νῖνος*,

like, are enumerated in the exeget. Hdb. on the passage and in Winer's R.W. i. p. 587 f.—In the parallel passage 2 Chr. xxxii. 21 the number of the dead is not given, but it is merely said, "The angel of the Lord destroyed all the valiant men and leaders and captains in the camp of the Assyrian king," a statement which Gramberg in his blind zeal against Chronicles, and copying him Winer (R.W. i. p. 588) have distorted into this, that according to Chr. "*only* the leaders and officers" were killed.

[1] Herodotus (ii. 141) gives a very distorted tradition of this defeat of Sennacherib, without doubt after the narrative of the Egyptian priests, according to which the Deity promised to king Sethon a priest of Vulcan at his entreaty the victory over the mighty advancing host of Sennacherib, whereupon in the night mice spread themselves among the foes (in the Assyrian camp), and gnawed the quivers, bows, and straps of the shields, so that they were obliged to flee the next morning without weapons, and many of them were put to the sword. That in this priestly legend the defeat of the Assyrians is ascribed to mice, J. D. Mich. explained by the fact, that among the Egyptians the mouse was the hieroglyph of devastation and extermination (comp. *Herapoll. Hieroglyph.* i. 50.) As historical element of the legend this only can be retained, that the knowledge of the annihilation of the Assyrian army by a miraculous interposition of the Diety had reached the Egyptians, and that they ascribed it to the prayers of their king, inasmuch as the expedition of Sennacherib was directed at the same time against Egypt. Nothing more can be inferred from it, certainly not that Sennacherib actually advanced to the district of Pelusium. On the contrary we may without hesitation infer from the definite predictions of Isaiah in our chapter, especially in vv. 32—34 and in Is. x. 32—34, that Sennacherib himself, after his messengers, sent from Libnah with a letter by his own hand to Hezekiah, could not procure the surrender of Jerusalem, and after he had taken all the other fenced cities of Judah, advanced with his whole army against Jerusalem the capital, in order to conquer it by force of arms, and that here his army was smitten by the destroying angel, before he had actually begun the siege. This conjecture has also, irrespective of these predictions, the greatest probability in itself. For if the report of the approach of Tirhakah induced him to make every effort to force the surrender of Jerusalem, he would not certainly venture, after the failure of his negotiations there, to advance towards Egypt, so long as he had not conquered Hezekiah and taken Jerusalem.

Ninus, the capital of the Assyrian empire, and residence of the Assyrian kings, built by Nimrod (Gen. x. 11), a very great and strong city. According to Jon. i. 2, iii. 3, iv. 11, it was a great city of three days' journey; according to Diod. Sicul. ii. 33 it was 480 stad. in circumference, and had very high and extremely thick walls, and was almost impregnable as well by these walls as by its position on the eastern bank of the Tigris, but yet was taken in 625 B.C. by Cyaxares of Media and Nabopolassar of Babylon, and razed to the ground (comp. our remarks on xv. 19), so that from that time only heaps of ruins remain, on which at present opposite Mosul stand several villages, as Nunia or Nebbi Yunus, Nimrud, Kalta, Numia, and Khorsabad, خرسباد. Comp. Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 94 ff. 114 ff., Gesen. *thes.* ii. 881 f., Winer R.W. ii. p. 187 ff. and Forbiger Hdb. ii. p. 611. Only two years ago the French consul Botta at Mosul caused diggings to be made in these ruins, by which, especially in the village Khorsabad, many interesting remains of masonry with sculptures and cuneiform inscriptions were brought to light. Comp. the description and drawings of these in the Journ. Asiat. quatre série tom. ii. sqq. Paris 1842—43.—V. 37. In conclusion the fate of Sennacherib is recorded. That his murder did not occur immediately after his disgraceful return, appears from the clause, "and dwelt at Nineveh." He must have lived fourteen or fifteen years longer. Nothing certain is known of the god Nisroch (נִסְרֹךְ.) Most derive the word from נֶשֶׁר, نسر, an eagle, with reference to the circumstance, that the Oriental astronomers call two constellations eagles (comp. Ideler, Urspr. der Sternnamen p. 416), that the eagle was adored by the ancient Arabs (Pococke, *spec.* p. 94, 199) and in the Persian religion was a symbol of Ormuzd; comp. Comm. on Is. i. p. 975 f. and Win. R.W. ii. p. 189. Other explanations see in Selden *de Diis Syr.* ii. 10 and *Addit.* p. 323 f., Carpz. *Appar.* p. 519 and Gesen. *thes.* ii. 892.—Movers (Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 68, 506 f.) takes Nisroch to be the supreme deity of the Assyrians, of whom Philo in Euseb. præp. ev. i. 10 says, "that Zoroaster teaches, that the supreme deity is represented by the eagle's head, and also assumes, that the same corresponds to the Egyptian Sun-god Phre with the head of an eagle or hawk.—Sennacherib's murderers were his

sons Adrammelech, who according to widely prevalent custom (comp. Gesen. on Is. vii. 6) derived his name from deity, and from him indeed whom the inhabitants of Sepharvaim worshipped (xvii. 31) and Sharezer (שַׂר־אֶצֶר), that is, probably prince of fire. בְּנָיו moreover is wanting in our text. The country of Ararat is a part of the Armenian highlands, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 155. Ararat still denotes the highest summit of a branch of the great Taurus range, which rises in two peaks far above the other mountains on the high table land of the Araxes, twelve hours southwest of the city Eriwan. This is the *mons Abus* covered with perpetual snow, ὁ Ἄβος of Strabo, Plin. and Ptolem., called by the Persians Kuhi Nuch, or Noah's mountain. The highest peak of it, the great Ararat, Aghri Dagh, rises, according to the measurements of Parrot, who ascended it for the first time, Sept. 22—28, 1829, 13,530 feet above the plain of Araxes, and has an absolute height of 16,254 feet. The Little Ararat, Kutshuk Dagh or Kutshuk Aghri Dagh rises 12,284 feet above the level of the sea. Comp. Fr. Parrot's Reise Zum Ararat, Berlin, 1834, second part, and the extracts from it in Ritter's Erdk. x. p. 477 ff., 486 ff.—"And Esarhaddon his son became king in his stead." This king, whose name אֵסַר־חַדּוֹן, Ἀσορδάν, Ἀσαραδάν (Ezr. iv. 2 LXX.) is not yet satisfactorily explained (comp. Gesen. and Hitz. on Is. xxxvii. 38 and Ges. *thes.* i. 133) is mentioned also in Ezr. iv. 2 and Tob. i. 21 (Σαχερδονός, Cod. Al. Σαχερδών, Compl. Ἀχειρδωνός) and by Berosus in *Euseb. chron. arm.* p. 19 f. under the name *Asprdanus* according with the LXX. According to Berosus he was first viceroy of Babylon, afterwards eight years king of Assyria. In the canon of Ptol. he is called Ἰσαρίνδινος, and said to have reigned thirteen years.[1]

[1] Of v. 37 Berosus and Abydenus in *Eusebii chron. arm.* afford some fragmentary confirmations. According to Berosus (*l. c.* p. 19) Sennacherib was murdered by his son Ardumuzanes. In Abyd. (*l. c.* p. 24) Sennacherib was succeeded by Nergilus, whom his son Adrameles murdered, while Adram. again was murdered by his brother Axerdis. Axerdis is said to have pursued his army with mercenary troops to Byzantium, and besides, to have gained possession of Egypt and the interior of Syria. The identity of Axerdis with Aserdan or Esarhaddon is scarcely to be doubted. The notice of Nergilus and his

CHAPTER XX.

SICKNESS AND RECOVERY OF HEZEKIAH, VV. 1—11. ARRIVAL OF A BABYLONIAN EMBASSY AT JERUSALEM, VV. 12—19. HEZEKIAH'S DEATH, VV. 20, 21.

A parallel account also of the first two events here mentioned, agreeing almost word for word with our text, is found in Is. xxxviii. and xxxix., the relation of which to our own is indicated in the remarks on xviii. 13. But the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness is there followed by his song of thanksgiving after his recovery (Is. xxxviii. 9—20), which is here wanting.

Vv. 1—3. "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." By בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם the sickness of Hezekiah is placed in the same time with the preceding event, in which case it was certainly still possible, that it occurred shortly after the departure of the Assyrians, as the last verses of the preceding chapter anticipate a later occurrence; but decidedly against this view laid down by Vitr. and Ges. on Is. xxxviii. 1 is the circumstance, that, as

murder by Adrameles appears to be a distortion of the murder of Sennacherib by his son related in our text and confirmed by Berosus. But at the foundation of the account of the conquest of Syria seems to lie the historical fact, that Esarhaddon undertook an expedition against hither Asia, in which he not only brought Babylonian colonists into the depopulated kingdom of the ten tribes, but also by his generals carried away king Manasseh captive to Babylon. (2 Chr. xxxiii. 11.) Against this a chronological difficulty no doubt arises. For if Sennacherib reigned only eighteen years, and attained to the sovereignty in 716 (see on xviii. 13), his successor Esarhaddon would have ascended the throne almost simultaneously with Manasseh, at most one or two years later. But the carrying of Manasseh to Babylon must have taken place at the earliest in the twenty-second year of his reign (comp. on xxi. 15), when Esarhaddon would have been no longer alive, if he had reigned only eight or thirteen years. But this chronological difference can by no means induce us to abandon the connection of the captivity of Manasseh with the said expedition of Esarhaddon to Syria and Palestine, as the statements of Berosus concerning the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon are proved false by the fact that he has made the period from Sennacherib to Nebuchadnezzar twenty years too short. Comp. the remarks on xx. 12.

according to v. 6 fifteen years are to be added to the life of Hezekiah, his sickness must have occurred in the fourteenth year of his reign, since according to xviii. 2 he only reigned twenty-nine years. With this also agrees the farther Divine promise, v. 6, that the Lord would deliver him out of the hand of the king of Assyria. We must therefore with the Rabb. in the *Sed. Ol. rab.*, with Ussher, and the majority of interpreters, place Hezekiah's sickness in the fourteenth year of his reign, or in the beginning of the invasion of Sennacherib, when Jerusalem was first threatened by the enemy. Some earlier and all later expositors take the sickness of the king to be an attack of the plague, and connect it with the destruction of the Assyrian army by the same plague breaking out in the camp. But this connection is disproved by the fact that Hezekiah's sickness falls in the first year of the Assyrian invasion, whereas the destruction of the host took place, according to xix. 19, only in the third year of it. To this is added, that שְׁחִין is nowhere used in the Old Testament of the plague or plague boil, but only either of the ulcers of the leprosy (Job ii. 1, 7, 8) or of other inflammatory ulcers (Ex. ix. 9), and poultices of figs are indeed laid on plague boils by the Arabian physicians, but are equally often, according to the testimony of the ancients as well as universal experience, applied to other ulcers, because the fig *διαφορεῖ σκληρίας* (Dioscor.) and *ulcera aperit* (Plin.) Comp. the many testimonies on this point collected by Celsius in the *Hierobot.* ii. p. 373. We must therefore think of another disease with an inflammatory ulcer, because not the slightest trace can be discovered in the text of the plague raging at that time in Jerusalem, though the disease cannot be more particularly determined. See the various conjectures about it in Schmidt's bibl. Medicus p. 567 ff.—צַו לְבֵיתֶךָ "give charge concerning thine house," put thy house in order, arrange thy last will (2 Sam. xvii. 33), "for thou shalt die and not live," that is, thy sickness is unto death, namely, without the miraculous aid of God. V. 2. "He turned his face to the wall," not as Ahab (1 Ki. xxi. 4) from displeasure and vexation, but "away from the bystanders to be more collected in prayer" (Gesen.) The Chald. understands קִיר quite erroneously of the wall of the sanctuary.—

V. 3. In his prayer Hezekiah appeals to his walk before the Lord

in truth and with a perfect heart, quite in keeping with the legal stand-point of the old covenant. On לֵבָב שָׁלֵם see above p. 132. "And Hezekiah wept sore," not merely because he must die without having an heir to the throne, as Josephus states, but because he was to die in the middle of his life, whereas the Lord had promised long life to the pious.

Vv. 4—7. The prayer of the pious king is immediately heard. Before Isaiah returned to his dwelling, he receives a Divine revelation to return to the king and announce to him, that the Lord will heal him within three days and add fifteen years to his life, that he will also deliver him from the power of the Assyrians and protect Jerusalem, whereupon the prophet returns and causes a lump of figs to be laid on the ulcer, in consequence of which Hezekiah recovered, and at the sametime gives the king at his request a miraculous sign in confirmation of the restoration announced to him.[1] V. 4. וַיְהִי יְשַׁעְיָהוּ וגו "And Isaiah had not yet gone out of the inner city," . . . . הָעִיר הַתִּיכוֹנָה is the city of David on Mount Zion, or more probably the inner part of the city of David, the royal castle. To this leads the *Keri* חָצֵר הת׳, which has been erroneously understood of the temple-court; the word עִיר denotes here probably, as in x. 25, the royal castle, so that the *Keri* expressed by all the old versions is a correctly explaining gloss; comp. the remarks on x. 25. V. 25. Instead of שׁוּב stands in Isaiah הָלוֹךְ, and the very suitable designation of Hezekiah as נָגִיד עַמִּי is there omitted. The determination of time added to the words, "I will heal thee," namely, "on the third day thou shalt go to the house of the Lord," ensures to the king the promised recovery. There is no foundation for Hitzig's assertion, that "on the third day" means often a very short space, that is, of several weeks. The

[1] This narrative is abridged in Is. xxxviii. 4—6. In v. 4 the particular determination of the time of granting his prayer, in v. 5 the words, "behold I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go into the house of the Lord," and in v. 6 the words, "for mine own sake and for the sake of my servant David," are omitted. Besides, vv. 7, 8 of our narrative are in Isaiah placed at the close of the chapter, after Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving, which is there inserted (vv. 21, 22), and vv. 8—11, which narrate the miraculous sign, are there considerably abridged in vv. 7, 8.

passage Hos. vi. 2 does not prove this pretended usage, for there it stands, "after two days" and "on the third day." The presumption, that Hezekiah could not have been able actually to go to the temple on the third day, rests partly on the denial of every definite prediction, partly on the erroneous assumption that he was seized by the plague. V. 6. The announcement, also, that the Lord would add fifteen years to his life, we cannot with the rationalists take to be a *vaticinium ex eventu*, because definite statements of time by no means belong to the impossibilities of prophecy. On the second half of v. 6 comp. on xix. 34. —V. 7. דְּבֶלֶת תְּאֵנִים lump of figs, cake of figs, παλάθη, from דָּבַל *in unum coegit idque rotundiori forma.* Comp. on these fig-cakes Faber on Harm.'s Beob. i. p. 389 f. and Ges. *thes.* i. 311. On שְׁחִין see on v. 1. At the close the event of his recovery is immediately appended by וַיְחִי. It is possible that the whole verse belongs to the close of this narrative after v. 11, that the prophet first prescribed the means, after he had given the king the miraculous sign recorded in the following verses. Still this assumption is not certain, but it may with equal probability be assumed, that Hezekiah only after the lump of figs was prescribed sought and also received the sign assuring him of the promised recovery.[1]

Vv. 8—11. This sign (אוֹת comp. on xix. 29) consisted in the miraculous return of the shadow on the dial-plate of Ahaz, because Hezekiah, when the choice between the progress or regress of the shadow was granted, as formerly the choice between a sign from the height and a sign from the depth was given to Ahaz, decided for its regress. The phrase מַעֲלוֹת אָחָז "steps of Ahaz," is perhaps scarcely to be understood with the LXX., Syr., and Joseph. (Ant. x. 11, 1), of the steps of stairs or of a stair in the palace of Ahaz, which, as Martini (Abhdl. von den Sonnenuhren der Alten. Lpz. 1777 p. 36 f.), and others assume,

[1] At all events the transposition of those verses in the narrative of Isaiah to the end of the chapter has its ground in the former assumption, and cannot be set down with Gesen. merely to the account of a transcriber, who may have omitted it in the right place and afterwards appended it. The 21st verse of Isaiah may conveniently stand at the end of the chapter after the song of thanksgiving; the 22d verse only seems to me to have been appended afterwards from our narrative.

was so constructed, that at the same time the shadow of an object, perhaps of an obelisk, falling on it indicated the hours, but denotes probably, as most expositors following the Chald. think, a proper dial-plate, which Ahaz might have received from Babylonia, where sun-dials were invented (Herod. ii. 109), the nature of which, however, as nothing definite can be elicited from the text, must remain undetermined, namely, whether, as R. Elia Chomer in Grotius on the passage thinks, it consisted of a hemispherical cavity in a horizontal square stone, provided with a gnomon or index in the middle, the shadow of which fell on different lines cut in the hollow surface, in the form of the sun-dials, which Vitruvius calls *Hemicyclium*, and the invention of which he ascribes to the Chaldean Berosus[1] *(de archit.* ix. 9 or 8 *edit. Schneid)*, or whether it consisted (Hitz.) merely in a vertical index (*γνώμων*) surrounded by twelve concentric circles (*πόλος*), or in an obelisk-like pillar set up in an open elevated place with encircling steps on which the shadow fell (Knobel.) The last view appears, indeed, to correspond most with the words of the text, though מעלות may very well denote merely *degrees*, and in a vertical gnomon we may also speak of the going down and returning of the shadow. The מעלות degrees denoted not whole hours, but much shorter portions of time, as the dial corresponding to the words, "shall the shadow go (forward) ten degrees or go back ten degrees" must have had more than twenty מעלות. Now, with regard to the miracle itself, Lilienthal (d. gute Sache d. Offenb. ix. p. 422 ff.) has satisfactorily proved that the text does not require the assumption of a regression of the sun or a reversion of the rotation of the earth, as the church fathers Ephr. Syr., Jacob of Edessa in Ephr. (*Opp.* i. p. 563), Theod., and many others

[1] Not the celebrated historian but an older mathematician of this name; comp. Martini, Abdhl. v. d. Sonnenuhr. p. 40 ff. There also p. 48 ff. is found a description of the time-pieces invented by Berosus, and drawings of them after some old specimens dug up in Italy. Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 983) erroneously says, that this kind of sun-dials was called *σκαφίς* or *ἡμισφαίριον*, and that Vitruvius ascribes their invention to the Chaldean Berosus. For Vitruvius says *l.c. Hemicyclium excavatum ex quadrato ad enclimaque succisum Berosus Chaldaeus dicitur invenisse; Scaphen sive hemisphaerium Aristarchus Samius.* On the nature of the Scaphae invented by Aristarchus comp. Martini i. p. q. p. 98 ff.

believed, but only asserts a miraculous recession of the shadow, in explanation of which, however, we do not need the hypothesis of a rising and sinking, by means of an earthquake, of the body that cast the shadow on the steps, but only the assumption of a miraculous refraction of the sun's rays effected by God at the entreaty of the prophet, for which faint analogies occur in the usual course of nature, as, for example, the phenomenon quoted by all expositors, observed in the year 1703 at Metz in Lothringen, by the prior of the monastery there, P. Romuld and others, namely, that the shadow of a sun-dial went back an hour and a half.[1]

Vv. 12—19. Arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors of Merodach-baladan at Jerusalem, comp. Is. xxxix.—Vv. 12, 13. בָּעֵת הָהִיא "At that time," when Hezekiah was recovered from his sickness. Merodach-baladan[2] is the same as well with the *Μαρδο-*

[1] In our text the regress of the shadow only is mentioned, as in Is. xxxviii 8, at the beginning. When, therefore, it is there said again, "and the sun returned ten steps (degrees)," it is obvious that by a usual metonymy *causa pro effectu*, the sun is named instead of the shadow of the sun's rays falling on the dial. The various opinions concerning this miracle, which has been mythically expounded in a natural way by the rationalists, see in Carpzov. *Appar. crit.* p. 351 ff., Schmidt bibl. Mathem. p. 534 ff., Lilienthal i. p. q. p. 414 ff., in the exeget. Hdb. on the passage, in Gesen. Comm. on Is. xxxviii. 8, and the works there quoted.

[2] So is this Babylonian king called, Is. xxxix. 1, מְרֹאדַךְ בַּלְאֲדָן; in our text, on the contrary, by a frequently occurring change of the labials בְּרֹאדַךְ בַּלְאֲדָן. In Jer l. 2 מְרֹדַךְ occurs along with *Bel* as the name of a Babylonian idol, probably Mars (comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 818), as in general among the Assyrians and Babylonians the names of the gods are often found repeated in the names of kings and nobles; comp. Ges. Comm. on Is. i. p. 281. At all events P. v. Bohlen's explanation is to be rejected, according to which מראדך = مردك *merdek homunculus*, and בלאדן = بلادان *i.e. homo laudatus.* Comp. on the contrary Kleinert in the Dörpt'schen Beiträgen i. p. 214 ff.—Gesen. *thes.* ii. 818 wishes to derive מראדך *a stirpe Mord, Mort, quae et mortem et caedem significat.* בלאדן he takes, *l.c.* i. 226, to be contracted from בעל אדן, *cui Bel est dominus*, according to which the Greek name Μαρδοκέμπαδος may, with Kleinert *l.c.* p. 218, be explained from מרדך נבו אדן *cui Nebo est dominus.*

κέμπαδος in the can. of Ptol., as with the Merudach Baldanes of Beros. in Polyh. in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 19, and reigned according to Ptol. twelve years, 721—709, in Babylon According to Polyh. after the murder of *Hagises* (or *Acises*) he assumed to be independent sovereign of Babylonia; but was, after six months, slain by *Elibus*; but the latter again, in the third year of his reign, was subdued by Sennacherib and carried to Assyria, whereupon Sennacherib appointed his son Asordan (Esarhaddon) king of Babylon.[1] The כִּי שָׁמַע of our text for וַיִּשְׁמַע

[1] The identity of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus is pretty generally acknowledged in modern times, whereas its identity with the Marudach Baldanes of Berosus has been denied by Winer (R.W. i. p. 123 and 256 f. ii. p. 100) and Hitzig on Is. xxxix. 1 on chronological grounds, while Knobel on Is. xxxix. 1 maintains the latter and disputes the former. Knobel rightly maintains for his opinion the full agreement of the names (in Beros. and the biblical text); but when he attempts to prove from Is. xxix. 2, comp. with 2 Ki. xviii. 15 f., and 2 Chr. xxxii. 25—31, that the arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors at Jerusalem falls in the year 703, in which, according to Berosus, Merodach-baladan reigned, whereas Mardocempadus was king from 721—709, the untenableness of this argument is easily shown. The verses quoted from Chronicles contain a summary of that which was to be communicated concerning Hezekiah, from which, however, it does not follow that the acts of this king here brought together were all performed in the interval between his sickness and the arrival of the Babylonian embassy. The circumstance also that Hezekiah showed the ambassadors his whole treasury, the silver and gold, the spicery and the precious oil, his whole armoury, and all that was found in his treasures (v. 13 and Is. xxxix. 2), does not imply that he must have been in possession of greater treasures and power than he could have had in a year or two after the departure of Sennacherib; comp. our remarks on v. 13. But the arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors must not for this reason be placed ten years after Hezekiah's sickness, because they assigned as the ostensible object of their mission to congratulate the king on his recovery (v. 12), and at the same time to enquire concerning the miracle of the recession of the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxxii. 31), an object which they could not pretend to have ten years after the event. To reject with Knobel this historical statement as unhistorical is uncritical caprice. As the Babylonian ambassadors had besides this ostensible object a still weightier one, in fact, according to universal and undoubtedly correct conjecture, to form an alliance with Hezekiah, or at least to seek his friendship in order to gain in him if possible a support against the Assyrians, we may certainly place their arrival not before the departure of Sennacherib, but also not long after it, and we believe we shall not be far astray, if we place it in the year 710, when Merodach-baladan, after the annihi-

in Isaiah is at all events clearer, although the reading of Isaiah may be original: on the contrary the חִזְקִיָּהוּ of our text appears

lation of the best part of the Assyrian army, had the fairest opportunity of revolting, as he intended, from Assyria, and obviously with this design sought the friendship of Hezekiah. Now, as according to the canon of Ptol., Mardocempadus was at this time still alive, there is nothing on this side to hinder the identification of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus; but with regard to the chronological difference, on account of which Hitz. and Win. take the Merudach B., mentioned by Beros., to be different from our Merodach-baladan, Hitz. especially urges, that in Polyh. Merodach B. was slain by Elibus after a reign of scarcely six months, and against the latter again in the third year of his reign, Sennacherib took the field, slew him, and appointed his own son king of Babylon: but that Elibus is unquestionably the Belibus, whose reign the canon likewise states at three years, and dates from the 45th year after Nabonassar, that is, from the year 703.—Here there is certainly a difference between the canon of Ptol. and Polyh., while the identity of Elibus in Ptol., with the Belibus of Polyh., even if probable, is by no means certain. To this is added, that the canon knows nothing of an Asordan as regent of Babylon at this time, and thus at all events a difference between it and Polyhistor remains, which cannot with Hitzig be obviated by the assumption, that Asordan is concealed in the Apranadius of the canon, for to Asordan corresponds in the canon Asaradinus, who reigned from 680—667. We must therefore either assume, that Berosus passed over several sovereigns (Ges.). or that Polyh. has inaccurately extracted Beros. (Win. R.W. i. p. 258) and need not on account of this difference surrender the identity of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus. But Winer has urged another chronological difference. "Through Beros.," says he i. p. 256, "we reach with Merodach-baladan at the farthest to 697 B.C., whereas the canon of Ptol. places the beginning of his reign in 721 B.C., which comes nearer to the biblical accounts." This remark is founded on the circumstance, that the four sovereigns already enumerated on xv. 19, from Berosus (Sennacherib, his son Asordan, Sammughes, and his brother Sardanapalus) reigned altogether only sixty-eight years, according to which, if Nabopolassar, who succeeded Sardanapalus, attained to the sovereignty in 625 B.C., Sennacherib would have ascended the throne sixty-eight years earlier, that is, in 693, or if we assume for Asordan instead of eight, according to the canon of Ptol. and Syncellus thirteen years, in 698, whereas he must have become king about 716 B.C. The difference between Berosus, on the one hand, and the biblical accounts and the canon of Pt. on the other, has been long known and variously expounded. In my apol. Vers. p. 429 ff., I have shown that we cannot reconcile it either with Niebuhr (Kl. hist. u. philol. Schr. 1 Samml. p. 209) by shortening the fifty-five years' reign of Manasseh to thirty-five, or with Hitzig (Begr. d. Krit. p. 197 f.) by the gratuitous introduction of a king with a reign of twenty-one years between Sammughes and Sardanapalus in Berosus, but that the deficient years in Berosus must be attributed to his statements concerning the reigns

more original than וידחזקו in Isaiah, inasmuch as the reflection that the ambassadors might congratulate the king, not certainly on his sickness, but only on his recovery, might lead the redactor of Isaiah to change the words, "that Hezekiah had been sick" into "that he had been sick and was recovered."—V. 13. The וישמע also of our text has the presumption of originality in preference to the וישמח of Isaiah. "When Hezekiah had hearkened to

of Esarhaddon and Sennacherib. Subsequently Hävernick (Einl. ii. 1, p. 224) endeavoured to account for the difference by adopting the conclusions of Hofmann (die siebenzig yahre des Jer. 1836, p. 30 ff.), who by a comparison of the sovereigns from Asaradan to Nabonadius according to the received canon of Ptolemy, according to the astronomical one of Syncellus, and according to the ecclesiastical one of Syncellus, endeavoured to prove, that Esarhaddon reigned not eight or thirteen, but rather thirty-two years, and his two successors Saosduchin and Kyniladan not twenty and twenty-two = forty-two years, as the received canon states, but only nine and fourteen, that is, altogether twenty-three years, and that the numbers twenty and twenty-two were only transferred from the series of Assyrian sovereigns in *Euseb. chronic.* to that of the Babylonian kings, and the nineteen years deducted from these sovereigns in the canon were assigned to the reign of Asaradan. But Hävern. has allowed himself to be deceived by the extremely bold as well as arbitrary combinations of Hofmann, as he has altogether overlooked the fact, that they were designed for quite a different object, namely, to furnish the proof, that Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar 605 B.C., and Nebuchadnezzar, as he destroyed this city according to Jer. lii. 29, in the 18th year of his reign (?), reigned from 623—580 B.C. For this purpose Hofm. rejected as well the chronological statements of Polyh. as those of the canon of Ptol., and arrived at the given result, which can by no means be brought into harmony with the biblical chronology. For according to the Books of Kings and Chronicles, there are from the death of Hezekiah to the destruction of Jerusalem 110 years and six months (namely fifty-five years of Manasseh, two of Amon, thirty-one of Josiah, three months of Jehoahaz, eleven years of Jehoiakim, three months of Jehoiachin, and eleven years of Zedekiah); on the contrary, Hofm. puts for Asaradan thirty-two years, for Saosduchin nine, for Kyniladan fourteen, for Nabopolassar twenty-one, and for Nebuchadnezzar eighteen, that is, altogether ninety-eight years, so that Asaradan (Esarhaddon) would have ascended the throne sixteen and a half years after Manasseh, and the death of Sennacherib could not possibly be, as Häv. with Niebuhr assumes, almost contemporary with that of Hezekiah. But Hofmann's arrangement is in decided contradiction not only with the Bible, but also with the canon of Ptol.; for according to the latter Nabapolassar reigned from 625—604, and Nebuchadnezzar from 604—561; according to Hofm. the former should have reigned from 644—623, the latter from 623—580.

them," that is, to their congratulations and their business. The וישמח of Isaiah preferred by the modern expositors is nothing but a critically objectionable change. בֵּית נְכֹתוֹ "his treasure-house" (Chald., Syr., and Saad.) נֶכֶת is not connected with נכאת *spice* (Gen. xxxvii. 25), as Ges. *thes.* ii. 883, following Aquila, Symon., and the Vulg., assumes, but comes from the unused root כוּת (comp. كَبَتَ *farsit, implevit loculum)* and signifies properly *that which is laid up*, the treasure, as צָפוּן Job xx. 26; comp. Hitz. and Knob. on Is. xxxix. 2, and Fürst, *Concord.* p. 551. בֵּית כֵּלָיו his armoury, arsenal. בְּכָל־מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ in his whole dominion, that is, in every department of it, which he could command as his own. As Hezekiah, in 714 B.C., gave Sennacherib (xviii. 15) all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house, it might seem strange that only four years later, not long after the departure of the Assyrians, he should have again collected great treasures of gold and silver. But let us remember that it is not here said that his treasure house was filled with gold and silver, but only that he showed the gold and silver therein along with the other treasures and precious things. But with whatever reason it may be doubted that Hezekiah, after the payment of tribute made to Sennacherib, could have already again collected much treasure even in gold and silver, yet it is expressly observed in 2 Chr. xxxii. 23, that after Sennacherib's overthrow, many brought presents to Hezekiah from respect to him who by his steadfast confidence in the Lord, and by his prayer, had saved the country. Besides, it is not quite so improbable, that, as Vitringa and others have hinted, Sennacherib, in his hasty flight with the remnant of his army that was not slain by the destroying angel, might have left many valuable things in his camp, which as booty came into the royal treasury of Hezekiah.

Vv. 14—19. Hezekiah showed the Babylonian ambassadors all his treasures and precious things, because he obviously felt his vanity flattered by their arrival, as may be discovered from the answer he gave the prophet, from a far country, from Babylon are they come. Isaiah therefore announces the word of the Lord, that hereafter all his treasures would be carried away to

Babylon, and some even of his sons would be made courtiers in the palace of the king at Babylon. The sin of vanity is to be punished with the withdrawal of that of which the heart is proud. Moreover this prediction has not proceeded merely from the prophetic custom to threaten destruction directly from that people with whom the treaty was intended to be made. For this "prophetic custom," asserted by the rationalists, rests itself on a deeper Divine law lying in the nature of the theocracy, namely, that God the Lord punishes man by that wherein he has sinned; and this sentence of the prophet is no mere menace of human device, but a prediction inspired by the Spirit of God, which was also literally carried into effect by Nebuchadnezzar. יִקָּח, "one will take" (v. 18), is to to be preferred as the more difficult reading to the יִקָּחוּ of Isaiah, which stands here also in the margin as *Keri*. The words, "of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget," denote not necessarily the sons of his body, but in general the descendants of his body, so that from these words alone nothing certain can be drawn as to the time when the punishment denounced would be carried into execution. סָרִיסִים *ennuchi* stands here as often *sensu latiori* for courtiers, court-officers in general, as for example Daniel and his companions were (Dan. i. 8), without being castrated. V. 19. The answer of Hezekiah, "Good is the word of the Lord, which thou hast spoken. And he said, Well, may only peace and truth be in my days," Gesen., Hitz., Knob., and others, take to be an expression of that easy egotism, which is little affected by the fate of others. But, on the contrary, the author of the exeg. Hdb. has remarked: "Such a sentiment does not suit Hezekiah." The older expositors (Vitringa, J. H. Mich., and others) found in it the utterance of an humble acknowledgment of the righteousness and mercy of God. *Hiskias erroris monitus et sentiens se divinam indignationem in se juste provocasse, agnovit culpam et se coram Deo profunde humiliavit* (Vitr.) "Good is the word of the Lord," means, I am content with that which the Lord has determined, I resign myself to his will (comp. 1 Ki. ii. 38—42.)[1]

[1] *Bonum vocatur id in quo acquiescere par est, quippe ab eo profectum, qui nihil facit, quod non sit non tantum justissimum sed quod summa bonitate non sit temperatum, etiam cum poenas sumit.* Cleric.

Acquiescit in decreto divinae justitiae sibi a propheta denunciato — — persuasus omne verbum Dei et rigidiores etiam sententias decretorum ejus esse aequas, justas et bene meritas (Vitr.) And with regard to the other statement of the king, "Well, may only etc.," the same excellent scholar remarks: *laudat decreti divini temperamentum, quod cum Deus pro rationibus justitiae suae se ipsum huic calamitati potuisset objicere, sibi tamen pro clementia sua voluerit parcere et malum transferre in posteritatem.* Comp. 1 Ki. xx. 29.—אֱמֶת is not *status rerum stabilis* (Vitr.), continuance (Gesen., Umbr.), security (Knob.), but *fides*, fidelity, though not human fidelity, "which keeps peace, observes the tacit covenant" (Hitz.), but the fidelity of God, which keeps the promised grace for the humble. The sense is, may the Lord not withdraw from me his peace and his fidelity during my life. —The second וַיֹּאמֶר shows, that Hezekiah uttered the last words after a short pause, and no longer directly to Isaiah. For הֲלוֹא אִם stands in Is. v. 8 כִּי truly, *profecto*, not *quod* (Win. *lex.* p. 473.) הֲלוֹא *nonne* has often the affirmative sense, yes, well, comp. Gesen. Lehrg. p. 834. אִם is here an optative particle, as Ps. lxxxi. 9.

Vv. 20, 21. End of the reign of Hezekiah. בְּרֵכָה is the pond formed between the two city walls, and תְּעָלָה the aqueduct, by which the water of the upper Gihon was conveyed into this ברכה, and from it again into the city, see on xviii. 17.— With v. 21 comp. 2 Chr. xxxii. 33.

CHAPTER XXI.

REIGN OF MANASSEH, VV. 1—18, COMP. 2 CHR. XXXIII. 1—20; AND OF AMON VV. 19—26; COMP. 2 CHR. XXXIII. 21—25.

V. 1. "Manasseh was twelve years old when he became king." He was therefore born after that mortal sickness of Hezekiah, and ascended the throne very young, by which it is

in a great measure explained, that he inherited only the throne of his father, and not also the theocratic principles of his reign.

Vv. 2—9. Manasseh, as sovereign, pursued the path of his grandfather, Ahaz, promoted idolatry like him, and went even farther in order to fill up the measure of iniquity, so that under his long reign idolatry attained to a hitherto unknown height, and drew inevitably after it the sentence of Judah's rejection (comp. xxiii. 26.) This relapse into idolatry, which Hezekiah had endeavoured to eradicate with all zeal, can only be explained by this, that the reform of Hezekiah had wrought in the people only an external conversion to the legal worship of Jehovah, no real change of mind or heart; as we may infer with certainty from the predictions of Isaiah under Hezekiah, especially from chap. xxviii.—xxxii. The powerful ungodly party of the people, at the head of which stood the leaders of the people, the priests and prophets, who reeled through strong drink, were over-mastered by wine, who reeled in prophesying, stumbled in judgment, (Is. xxviii. 7, 14 ff.), who also sought help against the Assyrians in Egypt and its power instead of Jehovah, the rebellious people, the lying children, who would not hear the law, who said to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us true things, speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceit, get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, remove from our sight the Holy One of Israel (Is. xxx. 9—11), and all the hypocrites who honoured the Lord only with the mouth and the lips, but were estranged from him in heart, and whose fear of God consisted in the learning of human precepts (Is. xxix. 13), were not altogether extirpated by the Assyrians and with them from the theocracy, but were still to be exterminated by farther punishments (Is. xxix. 14 ff.) This antitheocratic party of the people had certainly encreased in power and extent during the latter flourishing years of Hezekiah, so that after his death, while Manasseh was still a minor, it gained the superiority, assumed the guidance of the young inexperienced king, and seduced him to the open introduction of idolatry. Seb. Schm. has very justly remarked; *Quamquam Hiskias rex fuit piissimus, tamen inter ministros ejus necdum subditos erant multi insignes hypocritae et idololatrae, inter quos Magister domus Jes. 22 expresse indicatur.*—V. 2, comp. on viii. 18, and xvi. 3.—V. 3. וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּבֶן "he built again

the high places," etc. comp. xvii. 4, and 1 Ki. xvi. 31—33. "He worshipped all the host of heaven." The worship of all the host of heaven first introduced in the times of the Assyrians is obviously of upper Asiatic, Chaldaic, and Assyrian origin. This worship "was not idolatry, as the Israelito-Phenician, but pure star-worship" (comp. Mov. d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 66.) The sun had, as among the Persians, sacred chariots and horses (xxiii. 11), and incense was offered to the stars (xxi. 4, xxiii. 12; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 5; Jer. xix. 13; and Zeph. i. 5) on the house-tops, as among the Nabataeans (Strabo *l.* xvi. 4, p. 441), or in the temple area, in the two courts, under the open sky, with the face turned towards the sun-rise (Ezek. viii. 16),[1] and indeed not merely to the sun and moon, but also to the signs of the zodiac and the whole host of heaven, that is, all the constellations (xxiii. 5); which is to be so understood, that the sun, moon, planets, and the other stars, in conjunction with the zodiac, were worshipped (Mov. i. p. 164), wherewith astrology, the interpretation of the stars and the calculation of nativities, as we find them among the later so-called Chaldeans, are closely connected.[2]

[1] The far-spread assertion, that the star-worshippers therein like the Magi held the holy branch Barsom at the nose (comp. Mov. i. p. 66, de Wette, Archaeol. p. 325), cannot be proved from Ezek. viii. 17. Comp. Häv. Comm. on Ezek. p. 117 ff.

[2] Movers, Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 65, justly remarks, "In all the books of the Old Testament which are written before the Assyrian period, no trace of star-worship is to be found; not as if the Phenician (Canaanitish) gods had not also a sidereal signification, but because this element was subordinate, and the expressions sun, moon, stars, and all the host of heaven, which did not occur before, become now very frequent." But when this scholar cites in proof of this, besides the passages already quoted by us in the text, Deut. iv. 19 and xvii. 3, with the design of proving that Deuteronomy is certainly Mosaic in spirit and essential form, but in its present condition belongs to the Assyrian period, we cannot assent to this assertion borrowed from rationalistic criticism, as it is not proved, and reject it the more unhesitatingly, as Movers himself afterwards (p. 157 ff.) distinguishes a threefold aspect of the adoration of the stars, (*a*) the pure star-worship of the Magi, which tolerates no image of the deity, and worships the stars by contemplation under the open heaven or on the house tops (comp. Job. xxxi. 26 f.); (*b*) the Syrophenician star-worship, which regards the stars as the authors of all becoming and perishing in nature, and makes the sun an idol, image, and bearer of the male power of nature, which is then associated with the moon as the female power of nature; (*c*) the

Vv. 4 and 5 go together forming one period. The וְבָנָה מִזְבְּחוֹת (v. 4) is taken up again (v. 5) by וַיִּבֶן מזב׳ and the בְּבֵית יְהוָה (v. 4) more exactly defined by (v. 5) בִּשְׁתֵּי חַצְרוֹת ב׳ יה׳. The two courts of the house of the Lord are the court of the priests and the great court of the people. The temple of Solomo had no more courts, comp. my treatise, d. Tempel Salomo's p. 112.—V. 6. Comp. on xvi. 3. עוֹנֵן *denom.* from עָנָן, properly to be employed about the clouds, to predict from the clouds. So here and Lev. xix. 26; Deut. xviii. 10, where it is connected with נָחַשׁ; then again in the farther sense, *augurari*, for example Is. ii. 6; Jer. xxvii. 9; Mic. v. 11. Other divisions and explanations of the words see in *Carpz. Appar. crit.* p. 540 f. and Ges. *thes.* ii. 1053.—As to נָחַשׁ see on xvii. 17.—"He prepared necromancers and cunning men." אוֹב not from אוּב *rediit* = le révenant, the ghost (Millius, Simonis, Hitz. on Is. viii. 19 and others), but from אב = אבב *cavum esse*, whence the Aram. אֲבוּב *tibia, fistula propter cavitatem*, means (*a*) *uter*, the leather bag (Job xxxii. 19), (*b*) *venter pythonis, qui obsessus instar utris inflati turgescit, ex quo spiritus immundus de futuris interrogatus respondet. Deinde partim de ipso* daemone *ventriloquo, partim de ipso* pythone, *necromanti et hariolo.* Fürst *Con-*

view which, flowing from the immutability of the stars in opposition to the mutability of all earthly things, worships the stars not only as the authors of all becoming, and perishing, but at the same time as the disposers and rulers of all sublunary things, and produced the astrology of the Chaldeans and in later times Zabaism. The distinction of these three views, which Movers calls the upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, the Syrophenician and the Chaldaeo-Babylonian, is founded in fact, but not, as Movers seems to think, as if one of these three views was always peculiar to one of the nations named, of which historical proofs are wanting, but so that we may regard the first and third as two successive steps of development, and oppose the two together to the form of star-worship cultivated among the Syrians and Phenicians. But the first form of pure star-worship existed in Chaldea and Arabia from the oldest historically known times, and against this kind of star-worship warning is given in the passages quoted from Deuteronomy, not against that introduced into Judea by Ahaz and Manasseh after the Assyrian period, which was connected with astrology. The farther proofs, also, which Movers p. 66, 67, adduces for the diversity of the Assyrian star-worship from the Phenician and Babylonian image-worship, are quite untenable.

cord. p. 21. The Rabb. explained it by פִּיתוֹם, that is *πύθων*; LXX. *ἐγγαστρίμυθος*. Other explanations see in Ges. *thes.* i. 35 and Win. *lex.* p. 26 f. Here it signifies the necromancer. יִדְּעֹנִי, which occurs only in connection with אוֹב, properly *sapiens*, denotes (*a*) the soothsaying spirit, Lev. xx. 27, *πνεῦμα πύθωνος*, Acts xvi. 16, (*b*) the soothsayer, 1 Sam. xxviii. 3 and 9; Is. viii. 19, etc.—V. 7. The image of Asherah, which he had made (v. 3), Manasseh set up in the very temple, which, according to the express declaration of the Lord, was to be the dwelling-place of his name (2 Sam. vii. 13; 1 Ki. ix. 3; 2 Chr. vii. 16 comp. with 1 Ki. vii. 16.) On לְעוֹלָם see above p. 121 f.—The words, "Neither will I make the foot of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers" (v. 8), refer to the promise 2 Sam. vii. 10, "I will appoint a place for my people . . . that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more," which was fulfilled by the selection of the temple for the abode of his name, see above p. 71. הֵנִיד *vagari fecit, expulit.* Concerning the condition, "only if they will observe to do," etc., comp. the remarks p. 123 f.—V. 9. But this condition Israel did not keep. Manasseh seduced them to do more evil than the Canaanites, whom the Lord had destroyed before them.

Vv. 10—15. The Lord also by his prophets warned Manasseh and the people that were seduced into sin by him, and threatened them with the fearful sentence of the destruction of Jerusalem and the surrender of the remnant of his people into the power of their enemies; but they did not hearken, as is expressly mentioned 2 Chr. xxxiii. 10, and in our narrative may be inferred from this, that it never speaks of a trace of repentance. The prophets who warned Manasseh are not named; Habakkuk probably belonged to them;[1] but their addresses were recorded in

[1] It is still disputed, indeed, whether Habakkuk delivered his predictions that are found in the canon in the time of Manasseh or in the first half of the reign of Josiah; but the sole ground which, according to Delitsch (d. Proph. Hab. p. xvii.), can be alleged against placing Habakkuk under Manasseh, namely, that the work of the Divine judgment to be executed on Judah by the Chaldeans is to be accomplished in the days of those to whom the message is addressed (בְּיֹמֵיכֶם Hab. i. 5), does not appear to me to be absolutely cogent, as the passage Joel i. 2 is not quite adequate to prove, that in the expression, "in

the annals of the kingdom of Judah (2 Chr. xxxiii. 18.)—V. 11. הָאֱמֹרִי the Amorites are mentioned here, as 1 Ki. xxi. 26 and Ezek. xvi. 3, *instar omnium* as the supporters of Canaanitish ungodliness. Concerning גִּלּוּלִים see on xvii. 17.—The phrase, "that whosoever heareth it both his ears shall tingle," (v. 12), denotes an unheard of event causing horror and amazement, comp. 1 Sam. iii. 11; Jer. xix. 3. Habakkuk also (i. 5), announces the Chaldean judgment as a work of the Lord creating astonishment and exceeding belief.—V. 13. "I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab." The line (קָו) and the plummet (מִשְׁקֶלֶת the level) was applied to that which was built (Zech. i. 16), but also to that which was to be levelled with the ground, utterly razed (Am. vii. 7.) Even prisoners were measured off with the line (חֶבֶל) in order to be slain or pardoned (2 Sam. viii. 2). Hence arose the expressions, "line of desolation, plummet of emptiness," Is. xxxiv 11. The line of Samaria accordingly means the line which is drawn for destruction over Samaria, the plummet of the house of Ahab, the extirpation which befell the house of Ahab. The sense therefore is, I will destroy Jerusalem as I destroyed Samaria, and exterminate its inhabitants, as I exterminated the house of Ahab. The following figure, "I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth the dish, who wipes it and turns it upside down," denotes still more strongly the complete extirpation of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem together with its total destruction. V. 14. "And I will forsake the remnant of mine inheritance," that is, the people of the kingdom of Judah alone remaining of all the peculiar people of the Lord. Concerning נָטַשׁ see above p. 132. The necessary consequence of the Lord's forsaking his people or withdrawing his grace from them,

your days," the life-time of the sons, who were partly born, partly to be born to the generation then arrived at manhood, must have been excluded. On the other hand, it must also be admitted, that the grounds for this view advanced by Häv. (Einl. ii. 2, p. 387 ff.) do not compel assent. Moreover, we may very fairly assume that Habakkuk delivered predictions under Manasseh concerning this sovereign and his ungodliness, and yet his predictions transmitted to us in the canon belonged to the times of Josiah.

is the delivery of them into the hand of their enemies, that they may become a prey and a spoil to them. בַּז and מְשִׁסָּה occur together also, Is. xlii. 22, and Jer. xxx. 16.[1]

[1] While hitherto Chronicles agrees with our narrative in the description of the idolatrous conduct of Manasseh, henceforth deviating from it, it relates farther (2 Chr. xxx. 11—17), that Jehovah brought the generals of the king of Assyria against Manasseh, who bound him with chains and carried him to Babylon. But when in his affliction he besought the Lord, the Lord brought him again to Jerusalem to his throne, whereupon he raised a second high wall on the west side of the city, and put garrisons in all the fenced cities of Judah, removed the strange gods and the idol from the temple, and cast out of the city all the altars of idols built on the mount of the temple and in Jerusalem, repaired the altar of Jehovah, sacrificed thereon peace-offerings and thank-offerings, and commanded the people to serve the God of Israel; but the people still sacrificed on the high places, though to Jehovah their God. This account appears, on a superficial examination, so little in accordance with the narrative of our book concerning Manasseh and the extirpation of his idolatry, effected only under Josiah (chap. xxiii.), that it cannot surprise us, that not merely Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2, p. 131 f., Winer (R.W. ii. p. 63), Hitzig (Begr. d. krit. p. 180 f.), and others following Gramberg, have rejected it as unhistorical, but also Mov. (Krit. Unters. v. 327, ff.) has abandoned the narrative of Manasseh's repentance as a traditional invention of a religious didactic tendency, and only endeavoured to maintain the fact of the carrying away of Manasseh to Babylon as a historical event, whereas the *whole* narrative has been very ably defended by Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 221 ff.) Thus much is antecedently certain, and is acknowledged even by Mov. himself notwithstanding his erroneous view of the sources of Chronicles, that the silence of our narrative as to these events concerning Manasseh can afford no reason for their rejection. For as our author often contents himself with a general account of the sovereigns, and is silent about such of their doings as exercised no important influence on the development of the theocracy, he might here also omit the captivity of Manasseh and his reformation after his return from Babylon, if it put no effectual hindrance to the corruption which he had introduced into the kingdom by his idolatry. In favour of the historical truth of Manasseh's removal to Babylon is (*a*) the circumstance, that no reason can be imagined for the invention of such a fact, inasmuch as neither his removal nor his release and return had lasting effects on the kingdom of Judah; (*b*) the agreement of this account with that which is remarked on xix. 37, concerning Esarhaddon's expedition against hither Asia and especially to Palestine. As shortly before the king of Babylon, Merodach-baladan, is mentioned as a sovereign independent of Assyria, the later unhistorical legend would certainly have made Manasseh be carried away either by Assyrian generals to Nineveh, or if, according to Hitzig's conjecture, it was copied after Is. xxxix. 6, by Babylonian generals to Babylon, but not by

Vv. 16—18. Besides his idolatry, to which he seduced his subjects, Manasseh sinned very grievously in this, that he shed so much innocent blood, that Jerusalem was filled with it from one end to the other. This statement Josephus (Ant. x. 3, 1), has thus paraphrased: *Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καταφρονήσεως ὁρμώμενος, πάντας ὁμῶς τοὺς δικαίους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἀπέκτεινεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν προφητῶν ἔσχε φειδώ· καὶ τούτων δέ τινας καθ' ἡμέραν ἀπέσφαξεν, ὥστε αἵματι ῥεῖσθαι τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα.*[1] V. 18. "He was buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza," thus in a separate family sepulchre probably on Zion (comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 189), in which also his son Amon was interred (v. 26.) This royal garden bore the name, Uzzah's garden, probably from its former owner, but by no means from the place, *ubi Usa óccisus est*, 2 Sam. vi. 8, as C. a Lap. and Calm. think. The name Uzza (עֻזָּא) occurs also elsewhere, for example 1 Chr. viii. 7; Ezr. ii. 49; Neh. vii. 51.

Assyrian generals to *Babylon*, as the later Jews, it is well known, were not so conversant with the ancient history of the Asiatic kingdoms, as to know that the territory of Babylon, having become independent of Assyria in the time of Hezekiah, was again, under Manasseh, an Assyrian province.—Concerning the time of the deportation of Manasseh to Babylon, which no doubt coincides with the expedition of Esarhaddon against hither Asia, in which the heathen colonists were brought to Samaria, as historical documents here fail, the prediction, Is. vii. 8, "that within sixty-five years Ephraim should be no more a people," furnishes a hint, inasmuch as the ceasing of Israel to be a people, was determined by the settlement of the heathen colonists in Samaria. But this point of time named by Isaiah is the twenty-third or twenty-fourth year of Manasseh's reign, in which the Rabbins in the *Sed. Ol.* p. 67 ed. Meyer, likewise Ussher (Annal. ad. a. M. 3327), and *des Vign. chronol.* i. p. 428 f. had fixed his captivity, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 428.—But of the duration of his exile there is no historical trace. Though from the fact that his reign is represented in the Old Testament as uninterrupted, we may perhaps conclude that he very soon received his freedom again, by a circumstance totally unknown to us. Hävern. indeed i. p. q., thinks with Hoffman, that his release unquestionably took place after Esarhaddon's death, but this "unquestionably" may very easily be questioned.

[1] There is also a well-known tradition among Jews and Christians, that Manasseh put to death the prophet Isaiah, and indeed caused him to be sawn asunder, to which very probably allusion is made in Heb. xi. 37 (comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 9 ff., and Bleek, d. Brief a. d. Hebr. ii. 2, p. 832 ff.), but which, as Gesen. i. p. q. and Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 57 certainly conjecture with right, was perhaps formed only on the foundation of our verse by the Hagadah of Judaism.

Vv. 19—26. Reign of Amon. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 21—25. Amon walked in all the way of his father Manasseh, serving all the idols his father had introduced, and was murdered in the second year of his reign by his servants, who had conspired against him, whereupon the people, however, slew all the conspirators and placed his son Josiah on the throne. Concerning Amon, Seb. Schm. remarks: *Hic rex Amon praeter impietatem notatu dignum nihil fecit.*—V. 19. The place יָטְבָה Jotbah, from which Amon's mother came, was, according to Hieron. (*s. v. Jethaba*) *urbs antiqua Judaeae,* but it is no farther known. Joseph. (Ant. x. 3, 2) writes it *Ἰαβάτη,* and Grotius identifies it with יִטְבָתָה, one of the Israelitish stations in the wilderness of Arabia, comp. Num. xxxiii; Deut. x. 7.

CHAPTER XXII.—XXIII. 30.

REIGN OF KING JOSIAH, VV. 1, 2; DISCOVERY OF THE BOOK OF THE LAW ON THE OCCASION OF REPAIRING THE TEMPLE, VV. 3—20; READING OF THE LAW IN THE TEMPLE AND RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT WITH THE LORD, CH. XXIII. 1—3; ABOLITION OF IDOLATRY AND SOLEMNIZATION OF THE PASSOVER, VV. 4—24; END OF JOSIAH'S REIGN, VV. 25—30.

Vv. 1, 2. Duration and spirit of the reign of Josiah. His mother Jedidah was the daughter of Adaiah of Boscath (בָּצְקַת), a town no farther known in the plain of Judah, comp. Jos. xv. 39. Josiah again walked like Hezekiah in the footsteps of his ancestor David, adhering undeviatingly to the law of the Lord. He had probably, as his ungodly father had died early, on his ascending the throne a child of eight years, come under the guidance of pious men truly devoted to the law of the Lord, who turned him to the God of his fathers, inasmuch as his rule was so theocratically righteous. The phrase, "turned not aside to the right or to the left," namely, from that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, is a description of undeviating adherence

to the commandments of the Lord borrowed from Deut. (comp. v. 29, xvii. 11, 20, xxviii. 14.)

V. 3 ff. The following narrative from v. 3 to ch. xxiii. 24 forms a closely connected section, in which all that Josiah did for the resuscitation of the true worship of Jehovah and the extirpation of idolatry during his reign is united into one grand scene, and the whole reform accomplished by this pious king is referred to the eighteenth year of his reign, because in this year the discovery of the Mosaic book of the law took place, by means of which the complete reformation of religion could be undertaken, and was actually carried into effect. How closely all the several events and undertakings of Josiah presented to the reader in this collective picture are connected together, the narrator himself indicates by placing the date, "it came to pass in the eighteenth year of Josiah," not merely at the opening, but also repeating it at the close of this section. But if we consider all the particular incidents that are brought before us in this section, the repair of the temple, the discovery of the book of the law made on this occasion, the reading of it before the king, the consulting of the prophetess Huldah, the summoning of the elders of Judah, and the solemn reading of the law in the temple along with the renewal of the covenant, the extirpation of idolatry, not only in Jerusalem and all Judah, but also in Bethel and all the cities of Samaria, finally, the arrangement and solemnization of the passover, it will appear of itself that they could not all be completed within a year, even if we should with Ussher (*Annal ad a.m.* 3381) delay the solemn festival of the passover to the end of the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign. But this delay of the passover is quite an unnecessary expedient, as, notwithstanding de Wette's protest against it (Einl. p. 257), it is established, that the years of the reign were always computed from Nisan (see above p. 184), so that the passover fell in the first month of the eighteenth year (xxiii. 23); whereas the date placed at the head of the section, "it came to pass in the eighteenth year" (xxii. 3), can decide nothing, because it is to be regarded as a superscription, and proves merely this, that the narrator comprehended the efforts of Josiah for the restoration of the legal worship of Jehovah, which were contiguous in point of time, and occupied a space of several years, according to the

order of nature under one general point of view. Hence alone it is explained that the account of the repairs of the temple is only inserted in vv. 3—5, and compressed into a single antecedent sentence, which presents the occasion for the discovery of the law. For the apodosis to וַיְהִי בִשְׁמֹנֶה וגו (v. 3) follows only in v. 8, and the period is to be thus construed in plain English: "It came to pass in the eighteenth year of king Josiah, when the king sent Shaphan . . . . to Hilkiah the high priest, to count the money that was brought into the house of God, and give it to the masters and builders who repaired the temple, . . . that Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe," etc.[1] The remaining events indeed follow one another in the narrative, so that they all appear to have happened in succession. But that the arrangement within this section is not chronological but natural, appears clearly from this, that the repairing of the temple must have commenced before the eighteenth year of Josiah, under which it is recapitulated, since in the very beginning of this year, in which at all events the transaction recorded in xxii. 3—7 falls, not only the builders were engaged in the repairs, but money had been already brought by the whole people to the house of God and collected by the Levites who kept the door. Farther, a restoration of the dilapidated temple

[1] Through this compression of the account of the repairing of the temple into one preliminary sentence not merely is the statement, that the royal scribe executed the commission received, omitted, but even the particulars concerning the occasion of the discovery of the book of the law in the temple. Besides, v. 5 is rendered obscure and ambiguous by the omission of a determination essential to perspicuity, and v. 7 wants the suitable connection with that which precedes. In the parallel passage, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—15, indeed, the narrative of the commission which the king gave to Shaphan, and of its execution also, serves only to bring out the discovery of the book of the law, but the whole progress of the affair is there much clearer, and is related more accurately and completely by the addition of several accompanying circumstances, from which at the same time it appears that the high priest found the book of the law, when he with the king's officers was bringing the money out of the temple. This relation of the two narratives presenting itself at once to the eyes of the unprejudiced reader, has, however, been so perverted by de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 67 ff.), that he charges Chronicles with "distortion of the sense, confusion and obscurity," applauds, on the contrary, the harmony and intelligibility of our narrative, and finds all clear and perspicuous. Compare, on the contrary, my apol. Vers. p. 279.

cannot in the nature of things be thought of, without the removal of the superstitious abominations that were found even in the temple. Equally inconceivable is the supposition, that all the people entered into covenant with the Lord (xxiii. 3), before a beginning was made in removing the prevailing superstition, or that the pious king himself should have read the book of the law in the temple and made a covenant before the Lord, while the Asherah was still standing in the temple, and the idolatrous altars erected by Manasseh, with the horses and chariots dedicated to the sun, were still in its courts. If the making or renewing of the covenant in consequence of the law having been publicly read was to be an act correspondent to the law, it could not have been completed without sacrifice. But would the king, who was so deeply alarmed by the curse of the law, have undertaken so solemn a transaction in the presence of the idolatrous altars and other apparatus of superstition in the house of Jehovah, would he not much rather have shrunk from such an undertaking as the most reckless impiety? Lastly, if the narrative were strictly chronological, it must be assumed that after the king had before the passover not only destroyed the idols and idolatrous altars in Jerusalem, but gone round to the whole land of Judah and to Samaria to destroy the altars of the high places and burn the idolatrous priests upon the altars (xxiii. 4—20); again after this passover the necromancers and cunning men, the teraphim and the idols and all the abominations in the land of Judah were spied out and now for the first time destroyed (v. 24). But these considerations sufficiently prove, that the several events of this section are arranged according to their natural connection, not in chronological sequence, and at the same time show that Josiah had begun his reform before the eighteenth year of his reign, and prosecuted it afterwards with still greater zeal. How much of it was effected before, and how much after the passover, cannot be determined from our narrative alone.[1]

[1] The result of the more particular consideration of our narrative tends to confirm the parallel account of Josiah's religious reform in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—33. According to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3, Josiah began in the eighth year of his reign, when a youth of sixteen years, to seek the God of his father David, and in the twelfth year of his reign to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, Asherim and the carved and molten images. But in his eighteenth year he sent also, according

Vv. 3—10. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—18. On the construction of these verses all that is necessary has been already remarked.

to this narrative, his scribe Shaphan to the high priest to take account with him of the money collected for the repair of the temple, and to deliver it to the builders. On this occasion the book of the law was found by Hilkiah, and through Shaphan delivered to the king, the prophetess Huldah consulted thereupon, the book of the law read in the temple in a solemn assembly of the people, and the covenant with the Lord renewed. This narrative closes with the words: "And Josiah took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel, and made all that were present in Israel to serve Jehovah their God; so long as he lived they departed not from Jehovah the God of their fathers" (v. 33.) From these words we may indeed infer that even after the making of the covenant consequent upon the reading of the newly discovered book of the law, the extermination of idolatry was still continued; but not with certainty, inasmuch as they too clearly evince themselves to be a closing formula terminating the section concerning the abolition of idolatry. The passover festival is mentioned in Chronicles (2, xxxv. 1 ff.), only after this concluding formula. Now, if it appeared to us above from the narrative in the Book of Kings, that Josiah prosecuted his reform even after the passover, the narrative of Chronicles may harmonize also with this. For even if Josiah laboured zealously from the twelfth to the eighteenth year of his reign for the removal of superstition, it may be easily conceived that the many monuments of an idolatry pursued for more than half a century, which were spread over the whole land, could not have been all at once eradicated. We must therefore perceive it to be antecedently probable, that after the king and people had, in consequence of the discovery and reading of the book of the law, renewed the covenant with the Lord, many a remnant of superstition will have been found, which was then first destroyed. Thus much, however, appears from the more chronologically exact narrative of Chronicles, that the principal steps for its removal took place before the eighteenth year of Josiah and before the finding of the law. For though it is natural to assume, that the efforts of Josiah for this purpose might have been summarily stated in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—7, and that the king should have in the first place only destroyed the superstitious abominations in Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood, and only when encouraged in his zeal by the discovery of the law have carried out its extermination in the whole land and beyond the boundaries of his own kingdom into the cities of Samaria, yet the express statement that money was collected for the repair of the temple not only from Judah and Benjamin, but also from Manasseh, Ephraim, and the whole remnant of Israel (2 Chr. xxxiv. 9), presupposes the contrary, and compels us to assume, that even before the eighteenth year of the king at least an important beginning had been made in the removal of idolatry as well in the whole land of Judah as in all the cities of Samaria. Without such a beginning the people of Judah and Israel would have taken little con-

V. 3. Besides Shaphan, the king sent also, according to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8, Maaseiah, the governor of the city, and Joah the chancellor, because the repair of the temple was no mere private concern of the king and the priests, but an affair of the whole kingdom, and especially of the capital. V. 4. וְיַתֵּם (from תָּמַם *perfecit, absolvit*), "that he deliver, pay over the money." In what manner the Levites who kept the doors collected the money from the people is not mentioned. According to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, they appear to have collected it from the people round the country, and not merely at the gates from the visitors of the temple. The arrangement once made by Joash for this object with chests (comp. xii. 10) is not mentioned here.—V. 5. The *Keri* וְיִתְּנֵהוּ is a bad alteration of the *Kethibh* וְיִתְּנָה or וְיִתְּנֹה = וְיִתְּנוֹ, "that he (one) should hand it over." The expression עֹשֵׂי הַמְּלָאכָה is used in a twofold sense; in the first place it signifies the masters of the work, as appears from the addition, "who had the oversight of the house of the Lord;" in the second place the builders, אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית יְהוָה, "who were (employed) in the house of the Lord;" for which it is more explicitly said in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 10, אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים בב״י. The construction מְפֻקָּדִים בְּבֵית י״ does not need the alteration of the *keri*, as the *hiph.* הִפְקִיד is also construed

cern in the repair of the temple of Jehovah, and would scarcely have appeared at the passover (2 Chr. xxxiv. 9 and xxxv. 18). In the interval between the finding of the book of the law and the passover the work begun might certainly have been continued, but the matter could not have been taken up from the first, because the passover fell on the fourteenth day of the first month. Upon the whole I cannot admit the correctness of the result obtained by Delitzsch (der Proph. Hab. p. xx.) from the comparison of the two accounts, that "the purification of the temple from idolatrous furniture is to be placed in the eighteenth year of Josiah." But there is absolutely no ground for the violent expedient of Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 334 ff.), that the narrative of Josiah's earlier reformation is introduced in our text in the wrong place, inasmuch as it belongs to the time before the finding of the book of the law; but its insertion in the wrong place is only due to an interpolation, which was affected in the source used by our author. The two learned men proceed on the unfounded assumption, that the author of our books intended to relate the several facts of the religious reformation effected by Josiah in exact chronological order.

cum acc. pers. et בְּ *rei*, comp. Jer. xl. 5. But the construction of מְמֻנֶּה *cum accus. rei* in v. 9 is unique. וַיִּתְּנוּ אֹתוֹ is no resumption of וַיִּתְּנָה, but connected with the subject עֹשֵׂי הַמְּלָאכָה "the masters of the work."—Vv. 6 and 7. Comp. on xii. 12, 13, 16. In 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12 the names of the inspectors of the works are also given. V. 8. סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה the book of the law (not, a book of the law, or a roll of the book of the law) can literally and historically mean nothing else than the book of the law of Moses or the Pentateuch. The finding of the book of the law in the temple presupposes that it was long lost. Although it by no means follows from this, that before its discovery there was no other copy of it in the hands of the priests or the people. For the book of the law found is no other than the temple copy,[1] which was deposited beside the ark in the holy of holies, and during the ungodly reigns of Manasseh and Amon, perhaps under Ahaz, when the temple itself had been profaned by idols, and as we may infer from the notification, 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, the ark also removed from its place in the holy of holies, was somehow lost, and was now found again during the repair of the temple. In what place of the temple it had hitherto lain, cannot be ascertained either from our text or from the words, "when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord, Hilkiah found the book of the law by

[1] Whether the exemplar written by Moses' own hand, as Grotius infers from the בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 14, or a later copy of it, is quite a frivolous question. For, as Hävern. Einl. i. 2 p. 608 very justly remarks, "even in the latter case it was to be considered as good as the autograph, with the same right with which the temple repaired by Josiah still remained the temple of Solomon." The assertions frequently made in the present day in connection with the attacks on the genuineness of the Pentateuch, that the book of the law found was not the whole Pentateuch, but only a part of it, Exodus or Deuteronomy, or a short abstract of the law, or a collection of passages from the last four books of it, or the substance of the older legislation, in reply to which Hävern. Einl. i. 2, p. 601 f. is to be compared, may now be regarded as set aside, since de Wette, the champion against the genuineness of the Pentateuch, in his Einl. p. 212, has acknowledged that our narrative contains "the first certain trace of the existence of our present Pentateuch." The assertion also of the rationalistic critic, that Hilkiah forged the law-book found by him under the name of Moses, has been already so ably refuted by Hävern. p. 597, that we need not farther dwell on it.

Moses," (2 Chr. xxxiv. 14), and is of little importance for the main object of narrative. The different conjectures on the point see in Seb. Schm. *ad h. l.* and *Buddei hist. eccl.* ii. p. 447 f. From וַיִּקְרָאֵהוּ it does not follow, that Shaphan read through the whole book at once. Neither is it implied in the words, "Shaphan read it before the king" (v. 10), that he read to him the whole book from beginning to end, for in the reading of the whole law in the temple (xxiii. 2) אֶת־כָּל־דִּבְרֵי סֵפֶר הַב׳ is the form of expression. But what passages or sections Shaphan himself perused and what he read to the king cannot be determined with certainty; but it is probable that among others he read especially the threatenings and curses of the law against its transgressors (Deut. xxviii. and perhaps Lev. xxvi.), because the reading made so terrifying an impression on him, that he rent his clothes from distress of mind.[1] Moreover whether the king was hitherto entirely unacquainted with the book of the law, or was instructed in the law only in a traditional way, or whether he had a copy of the law and had not yet read it through, or had not read it with due attention, so that the passages now read to him made so deep an impression, it is impossible to decide with certainty. Either case is conceivable, as it is known by experience, that books already read, by being read again under peculiar circumstances, make an impression upon us not before received. It is more probable, however, that no copy of the law had been hitherto seen by him, without however inferring from this, that there were no copies among the people except the long lost and now recovered temple copy. The deep and fundamental knowledge of the law, which all the prophets display, necessarily presupposes the dissemination of copies of the Pentateuch among them.

Vv. 11—14. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 19—22. In order to obtain advice in the distress of his heart concerning the punishments denounced against transgressors in the law, the king sent a deputation consisting of the high priest Hilkiah, his secretary

[1] J. D. Michaelis in his remarks on our verse wishes to explain this deep impression partly by the state of the times, the incursion of the Scythians into Asia, and the victories of the Nabopolassar. An explanation as unnecessary as far-fetched and improbable.

Shaphan, and other distinguished persons of his court (אֲשֶׁר לַמֶּלֶךְ 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22), to the prophetess Huldah to enquire through her the will of the Lord. Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, a different person from the king's scribe, appears afterwards as a friend and patron of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. xxvi. 24); he was the father of Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem appointed deputy governor over the people who remained in the land (xxv. 22 ff.; Jer. xxxix. 14, xl. 5 f., xlv. 1, xliii. 6.)—Of Achbor (עַכְבּוֹר) nothing farther is known than that his son Elnathan belonged to the courtiers of Zedekiah (Jer. xxvi. 22, xxxvi. 12.) In 2 Chr. xxxiv. 20 stands instead of him עַבְדּוֹן, an obvious mistake of the pen. Asaiah (עֲשָׂיָה) is mentioned nowhere else. Other men of this name occur, 1 Chr. iv. 36, vi. 15, xv. 6, 11, ix. 5.—V. 13. שָׁמַע construed with עַל means here, "to hearken to anything, to obey," for which אֶל is elsewhere used, as xix. 9 שָׁמַע אֶל stands for שָׁמַע עַל "to hear of some one." The explanation given by Hertz i. p. q. p. 160 f., "our fathers have not heard of the words of this book to do according to all that is prescribed to us," gives no appropriate sense.—V. 14. Of the prophetess Huldah we know nothing more than is here stated.[1] Her husband was keeper of the robes, that is, overseer, perhaps not of the priests' garments kept in the temple, as after the Rabbins Witsius (*de prophetissis* in his *Miscellan. ss.* i. p. 366, ed. 3, 1712) thinks, but over the royal wardrobe, and dwelt in Jerusalem בַּמִּשְׁנֶה "in the other part," that is, of the city, probably the lower city, which Joseph. (Antiq. xv. 11, 5) calls ἄλλη πόλις, on the hill Ἄκρα (comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 50), as appears evident from Zephaniah i. 10 and Neh. xi. 9, where עִיר מִשְׁנֶה stands. Several Rabb. with the Chald. arbitrarily make מִשְׁנֶה a school-house, בֵּית אוּלְפָנָא in the neighbourhood of the temple; and as arbitrarily the author of the *quaestiones in Paralip.* xxxiv. 22 ascribed to Hieronymus understands thereby *locum extra murum civitatis et antemurale*, and Hitzig on Zeph. i. 10, a new part of

[1] The conjectures of the Rabbins concerning this prophetess, see in Jarchi *ad h. l. et* 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22 and in Meyer's *Annotat. ad Seder Ol.* p. 117 f.

the city on the west within the external wall built by Manasseh; comp. on the contrary Maur. and Strauss on Zeph. i. 10.— For the names תִּקְוָה and חַרְחַס stand in 2 Chr. xxxv. 24 the forms תּוֹקְהַת and חַסְרָה. The expositors here raise also the question, why the king applied to Huldah and not to the prophet Jeremiah, who had then made his appearance. Kimchi has given the most probable answer to this, that Jeremiah was at the time in Anathoth, his native town.

Vv. 15—20. The prophetess Huldah confirms the apprehension expressed by the king, that the anger of the Lord was kindled against the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah on account of their opposition to his word, and announces that the Lord will bring all the words of the book read by the king, that is, all the punishments denounced in the law of Moses against backsliders and idolaters, upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants, but adds for the pious king the consolatory promise, that, on account of his sincere penitence and humiliation before the Lord, he shall not live to see the evil or the punishment threatened, but be gathered to his fathers in peace. In this answer of Huldah are distinguished, "the man that sent to her" (v. 15), and "the king of Judah who sent to enquire of the Lord" (v. 18.) J. D. Mich. understands by "the man" the individual person of Josiah, and by the king, the Jewish king *in abstracto*, and thinks, therefore, that the words "man" and "king" are misplaced by the fault of the transcriber. But the distinction is false, and the position of the words is quite correct. The man who sent to the prophetess is certainly in fact the king Josiah; but the general designation of him as "the man who sent to me," proves that by this is not to be understood the individual person of Josiah, but every man who wished to enquire of the prophetess the will of the Lord concerning the book of the law. To this man should the truth and certain fulfilment of the word of God be simply announced. But by the king of Judah is not to be understood the king in abstract generality, but the concrete person of the penitent and God-fearing king Josiah, to whom it was to be announced, that he should not live to see in his own person the threatened misfortune.—To the words הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתָּ (v. 18) we are not to supply a preposition, as עַל or

לָ (Cler.), nor the thought *eventura quidem erunt* (Vatabl.); but they stand absolutely, forming a protasis, the apodosis to which follows at the end of v. 19, but so that by an anacoluthon the apodosis attaches itself in form to the intervening sentence in v. 19, "As regards the words which thou hast heard, because thine heart was tender . . . and thou didst weep before me, I will also hear thee, saith the Lord." . . . Comp. *L. de Dieu* and *Starkii not. sell. ad h. l.*—V. 19. יַעַן רַךְ־לְבָבְךָ "because thine heart was tender," that is, was faint because of the punishment threatened to sinners, comp. Deut. xx. 3; Is. vii. 4; Jer. li. 46.—לִהְיוֹת לְשַׁמָּה וגו' "that they should become a desolation and a curse." These words often employed by the prophets, but occurring thus connected only in Jer. xliv. 22, rest on Lev. xxvi., and Deut. xxviii., where the transgressors of the commandments of the Lord are threatened with desolation of the land and every kind of curse. V. 20. "Behold, therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace." The phrase, to gather to his fathers, means merely, to cause to die, and is commonly indeed used of a gentle peaceful death, though sometimes also, as the cognate expression, to lie with his fathers, of a violent termination of life by murder, comp. xiv. 19, 22; 1 Ki. xxii. 34—40, so that this consolatory promise may be very well reconciled with Josiah's being slain in battle (xxiii. 29.) בְּשָׁלוֹם, which is in the most natural manner related to both sentences, denotes not so much a peaceful end by death on a sick bed, but is much rather determined by the following sentence to this, that he is to die, and be laid in his grave in peace, before the threatened judgment will have broken upon the city and land.

Chap. xxiii. vv. 1—3. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 29—32. Instead of resting satisfied with this, that freedom from this judgment was promised to him, Josiah much more did all that was in his power to bring his people to true conversion to the Lord, thereby to avert as much as possible the threatened curse, as the Lord had promised in his word forgiveness and grace to the penitent. He therefore assembled the elders of the people, then proceeded with them, the priests and the whole congregated people, to the

temple, there caused the book of the law to be read to the congregation, and made a covenant with the Lord, to which the people assented, binding themselves to walk uprightly in the commandments of the Lord. V. 2. Instead of הַנְּבִיאִים in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 30 we have הַלְוִיִּם. The older interpreters reconcile the two statements by the assumption, that these prophets were of the priests and Levites, as Jeremiah, who was of the priestly city Anathoth, and Urijah, who came from the Levitical city, Kirjath-jearim (Jer. xxvi. 20.) But this method is unnatural. The difference consisting of one word only, while all else agrees, can only be explained by an error of the pen, and this error falls to the charge, not of the author of Chronicles, but of that of Kings, or a transcriber of the latter book. For as there were at that time not more than two or three prophets (Zephaniah, Urijah, and perhaps Jeremiah) in Jerusalem, we should not expect special mention of them, though we might of the Levites along with the priests. וַיִּקְרָא he read, that is, caused to be read; for the king, who had the book already read to him, was certainly not himself the reader in the temple before the assembled people, as Abarb. and others thought.—V. 3. On וַיַּעֲמֹד וגו׳ comp. xi. 14; on וַיִּכְרֹת וגו׳ xi. 17; and on וְלִשְׁמֹר וגו׳ see above p. 20.—לְהָקִים וגו׳ "to establish the words of this covenant," that is, to realize them by deed, by fulfilling the commandments in the life, comp. Deut. xxvii. 26.—וַיַּעֲמֹד – – בַּבְּרִית "and all the people stood to the covenant" (Luth., D. W., and others), that is, accepted it, bound themselves to its observance. On the contrary Maur. and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 1039) explain, *et perstitit, perseveravit in fœdere.* The first view has the connexion, the second the grammar in its favour. We must therefore reconcile the two by assuming the construction to be pregnant: "they assented and adhered to the covenant."

Vv. 4—20. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—7, 33. Farther, Josiah caused all the monuments and remnants of idolatry existing in his whole kingdom to be exterminated, and even in Bethel and the other cities of Samaria the altars and houses of the high places to be destroyed, and the high priests to be slain. That the extirpation of idolatry effected by Josiah, which is here described, belongs not entirely but only in its close to the time

after the finding of the book of the law and the renewal of the covenant, has been already shown on ch. xxii. 3 ff.

Vv. 4—14. Extirpation of idolatry in Jerusalem and Judah. V. 4. כֹּהֲנֵי הַמִּשְׁנֶה *sacerdotes secundi ordinis* (Vulg., Luth., and others), the ordinary priests. The Rabb. falsely explain it of the *vicariis summi sacerdotis*. כָּל־הַכֵּלִים "every vessel" (Luth.), that is, the whole apparatus that was used in the worship of the gods, to which belonged the altars, idols, and other materials of worship. All these objects Josiah caused to be burned, as the law required (Deut. vii. 25), and indeed as unclean things without the city Jerusalem at the fields of Kidron. The שַׂדְמוֹת קִדְרוֹן are probably to be sought north-east of the city, where the valley of Kidron is broader than between the city and the Mount of Olives, and expands itself especially in a basin of some extent, which is at present cultivated, and contains plantations of olives and other fruit trees (Rob. Pal. ii. p. 33.) The brook Kidron in the east of the city (comp. 1 Ki. ii. 37) "is now nothing more than the deep bed of a winter torrent, that bears evident traces of being sometimes overflowed with a great body of water." Only during the heavy rains of winter does a stream flow in it, and even then not constantly, and the valley appears to have had no more water in former times than now (Rob. p. 38.)—"And carried their dust to Bethel," that is, the ashes of the wooden things burned, and the dust of the stone and metal articles of worship that were broken down, he caused to be carried to Bethel, in order to defile with these the idolatrous places of worship there.—V. 5. "And he removed the priests of the high places." כְּמָרִים occurring besides here only in Hos. x. 5, and Zeph. i. 4, denotes not priests of idols or even prophets of Baal (Hitzig on Zeph.), but, according to the express statement of our author, those priests whom the kings of Judah had appointed to offer incense on the altars of the high places, from whom the priests of the idols and those who offered incense to Baal, the sun, etc., were distinct. In Hos. x. 5 the priests appointed for the golden calves at Bethel are called כמרים. In Zeph. i. 4 also, כמרים are not exclusively priests of idols, but illegitimate priests in general, as well those who served Jehovah degraded into Baal as those who worshipped pro-

per idols. As, moreover, in v. 8, there are כֹּהֲנִים mentioned, who burned incense on the high places, we must understand by the כמרים non-levitical priests of the high places, and by כֹּהֲנִים (v. 8) levitical priests consecrated to the worship on high places. The proper meaning of כמרים is contested, comp. the different explanations in Pfeiffer, *dub. vex.* p. 455, and Iken, *dissert. philol. theol. num.* 12. The derivation, proposed after some Rabbins by most expositors, even by Ges. (*thes.* ii. 693), from כמר *nigredo*, according to which they must have received their name from their black dress, is decidedly opposed by the fact that neither the priests of the idols nor of the high places were ascetics or monks, and in ancient times the priests from India to Gaul wore robes of a white, and if possible of a brilliant white colour, comp. Bähr's Symbol. ii. p. 87 f. and the works there quoted.[1] It comes much rather either from כָּמַר in the Talmudical signification *abscondere* (comp. Buxt. *lex. rabb.* p. 1051) and denotes *eos qui latebras et secessus quaerebant, quo tutius imponerent vulgo* (Pfeiffer *l. c.*), or more probably *a voce* כָּמַר (לאט, קמר, כמן) *vi occulendi magicasque h. e. arcanas et reconditas artes exercendi dicti esse videntur* (Fürst, *Concord.* p. 559.) וַיְקַטֵּר and burned incense, namely, each of them, that is, that they might burn incense. מַזָּלוֹת are the signs of the zodiac, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 869. Concerning this worship see on xxi. 3. —V. 6. הָאֲשֵׁרָה is here = פֶּסֶל הָאֲשֵׁרָה comp. xxi. 3 and 7. This figure of Asherah Manasseh had made and placed in the temple, and after his return from Babylon no doubt removed (2 Chr. xxxiii. 15), but Amon had again replaced. Josiah destroyed it, burned the wood to ashes, and ground the metallic plating to powder. In the valley of Kidron, Asa had once burned an image (1 Ki. xv. 13), and Hezekiah had deposited (2 Chr. xxix. 16) the impurities (of idolatry) removed from the city. This valley was thus already defiled, even if it had not been regarded as unclean, because, according to our author, the

[1] Priests only sometimes wore black robes, when they sacrificed to subterranean gods, comp. Braun, *de vestitu sacerd.* i. p. 181 f., and the priests of Isis, when they awaited the return of the moonlight, *τοῖς δὲ μελανοστόλοις ἐμφαίνουσι τὰς κρύψεις καὶ τοὺς περισκιασμοὺς, ἐν οἷς διώκει ποθοῦσα τὸν Ἥλιον.* Plutarch *de Iside* in Calmet *ad h. l.*

burial ground of the common people was there. "The powder of the Asherah he cast upon the graves of the children of the people." בְּנֵי הָעָם denotes the people, the eminent and the humble, who had polluted themselves by idolatry, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 4—, in order to profane the graves of these idolaters (*in contemtum, si non etiam maledictionem mortuorum et in terrorem viventium.* Seb. Schm.)—V. 7. בָּתֵּי הַקְּדֵשִׁים the houses of the paramours (see above p. 227 f.) are perhaps only tents, that were erected in the court of the temple for the residence of these paramours, in which at the same time women lived, who worked shrines for Asherah, comp. on xvii. 30. On this worship, among others, Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 686) remarks: the castrated *gallus* (קדשׁ) imagines himself to be a woman: *negant se viros esse . . . . mulieres se volunt credi. Firmic.* He lives in the society of the women, and these again are singularly attached to the *gallus;* and offers at the same time the conjecture, that the women of Jerusalem prostituted themselves in honour of the goddess in the tents of the *galli* pitched in the court of the temple, for which the מחיר כלב came into the treasury of the temple.—Verses 8 and 9 can only have the sense, that Josiah brought the Levitical priests who had offered incense on the high places in the cities of Judah to Jerusalem, and forbade them for the future to make offerings on the altar of Jehovah, and thus excluded them from all priestly functions, but allowed them, as those priests who were excluded from the service of the altar on account of a corporeal defect, to draw their support from the revenues of the sanctuary according to the law Lev. xxi. 17—23. The high places throughout the whole land he defiled probably by scattering upon them the dust of men's bones (v. 14), and broke down the altars of high places erected at the gate of Jerusalem. כהנים are not *sacerdotes falsorum deorum* (Cler.), but priests of the tribe of Levi, who had addicted themselves to the worship of the high places (S. Schm. and others), on which account they are called (v. 9) כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת.—"From Geba to Beersheba" denotes the kingdom of Judah in its whole extent from north to south. Geba (גֶּבַע) assigned to the tribe of Benjamin, but transferred from this to the priests (Jos. xviii. 24, xxi. 17; 1 Chr. vi. 45), formed, according to our author and Zech.

xiv. 10, the **northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah**, and lay, according to Euseb. and Hieron., five Roman miles from Gophna, towards Neapolis. This place is, therefore, neither to be identified with Jeba or Gibeah of Saul or Benjamin, between es Suweinit and Wady Farah, or between Mukhmas and er Ram, nor to be sought in its neighbourhood, but is preserved in the Moslemite village Jibia (جيبيا) in the Wady el Jib (Rob. Pal. iii. p. 298), between Sinjil, that is, Bethel (see above p. 326), and Jifna (Gophna).[1]—Concerning Beer-sheba, see vol. i. p. 288.

[1] As much obscurity and contradiction still prevails among expositors and biblical geographers concerning Geba and Gibeah, inasmuch as most of them, down to v. Raumer, (Pal. p. 194), and Rob. (Pal. ii. p. 328), seek Geba in the vicinity of Gibeah and Ramah, and Winer (R.W. i. p. 465), on this presumption, declares the statement of Euseb. and Hieron. concerning the situation of Geba to be manifestly false, whereas Knobel, on Is. x. 29, absolutely denies the existence of a Geba in the tribe of Benjamin distinct from Gibeah, a revision of this question will not be superfluous. It may be regarded as generally admitted, that the Gibeah so often mentioned in the book of Judges, xix. and xx., and in 1 Sam., especially in xiii. and xiv., is one with Gibeah of Benjamin or Gibeah of Saul, east of Ramah (er Ram) and south of Michmash (Mukhmas), which is preserved in the village Jeba, between the Wady es Suweinit and W. Farah, comp. Rob. p. 325 f., and Thenius in Käuffer's Studien ii. p. 149. But this Gibeah is sometimes called Geba also in the Old Testament, as in Judg. xx. 10 and 33; 1 Sam. xiii. 3, xiv. 5, or even Geba of Benjamin, as in 1 Sam. xiii. 16, whereby the assumption of a Geba in the neighbourhood of Gibeah and Ramah has arisen. But that this assumption is quite unfounded, and that Geba in these places is only a variation of Gibeah, every one will be convinced who will carefully peruse these chapters; we may compare only in Judg. xx. v. 9 and 10.—But in 1 Sam. xiii. and xiv., Thenius (Comm. on the passage), has already recognized the identity and explained גֶּבַע as written for גִּבְעָה. But the notion of a Geba in the vicinity of Gibeah, derives its chief support from Is. x. 29, where the names Geba, Ramah and Gibeah of Saul, occur together. But even this passage proves nothing, and may easily with Knobel be so explained, that Geba is one with Gibeah of Saul, only another form of Gibeah. Besides the passages quoted here and above in the text, Geba is also mentioned in 2 Sam. v. 25; 1 Ki. xv. 22; 1 Chr. viii. 6; 2 Chr. xvi. 6, and after the exile, in Ezr. ii. 26; Neh. vii. 30, xi. 31, and xii. 29. In 2 Sam. v. 25, ("David smote the Philistines from Geba unto Gazer), Geba stands for Gibeon, as may be seen from the parallel passage, 1 Chr. xiv. 16, and in 1 Ki. xv. 22; 2 Chr. xvi. 6, probably for Gibeah, as has been already remarked above, p. 235. Lastly, the passage, 1 Chr. viii. 6, affords no decisive ground for

—The following somewhat obscure sentence, וְנָתַץ אֶת הַבָּמוֹת וגו׳ is to be apprehended thus: "he broke down the high places at the gates, (especially) those before the gate of Joshua, the governor of the city, which were at the left hand of any one (going in or out) at the gate of the city." At the city gates also altars of high places were erected, that those coming into the city and going out might there worship and offer. Now as besides these בָּמוֹת הַשְּׁעָרִים the בָּמָה before the gate of Joshua is mentioned, this can only thereby be rendered prominent as being particularly celebrated and specially sought after by the idolaters, although this is not indicated in the text by any particle. Hence Cler., Dathe, Maur., and others have supplied *et praesertim* before אֲשֶׁר. The following אֲשֶׁר before עַל־שְׂמֹאוֹל may not be referred with J. H. Mich. to שַׁעַר but only to the high place (במה) before the gate of Joshua, and עַל־שְׂמֹאוֹל אִישׁ can only mean to the left of any one, namely, who goes in or out (Cler., Schulz, Dathe, and others). At which of the gates of Jerusalem the governor of the city dwelt, so that it was named after him, is totally unknown.—V. 9. אָכַל מַצּוֹת to eat unleavened bread, means to derive his sustenance from the offerings brought to the altar, not, however, burned on it but designed to be eaten by the priests, comp. Lev. vi. 9, and xxii. 11—13, with xxi. 21 f.—V. 10. תֹּפֶת from תּוּף to spit out, is an object of abhorrence, an abomination, Job xvii. 16, an abominable place. Hence the place in the valley of Benhinnom was κατ'

the determination of the place. Knobel on Is. x. 29, however, goes too far when he rejects the existence of a Geba in the tribe of Benjamin distinct from Gibeah. For, not to speak of 2 Ki. xxiii. 8, and Zech. xiv. 10, where Geba is named as the northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah, which the Gibeah lying south of Mukhmas could not be, and to omit the testimony of Euseb. and Hieron. concerning the situation of Geba on the northern border of Benjamin, this assertion is contradicted by the list of the Benjamite cities in Jos. xviii., where, besides Geba (v. 24), a גִּבְעַת in the south, not far from Jerusalem, is mentioned (v. 28), and still more by the fact that both places are still preserved to this day with their old names. On the contrary the circumstance that after the exile, Geba only, and not Gibeah, is mentioned, can prove nothing, as the passages Ezr. ii. 22—28; Neh. vii. 27—33, and xi. 31—35, contain no complete lists of the Benjamite towns.

ἐξοχήν called הַתֹּפֶת, the abominable place, which served for a slaughtering place to the city, inasmuch as here on the funeral piles the carcases of the dead animals were burnt, comp. Is. xxx. 33, and Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 598. In this valley, when Ahaz introduced the worship of Molech into Judah (xvi. 3), the statue of Molech was erected, and Tophet chosen for the burning of children in the fire to Molech. The valley בְּנֵי הִנֹּם or בֶּן־הִנֹּם (Jos. xv. 8, and elsewhere), lies on the south side of Mount Zion, see the description of it in Rob. Pal. ii. p. 38 ff.— V. 11. Josiah also removed the horses consecrated to the sun, and burned the chariots of the sun. Although horses were sacred to the sun and were offered to him among many nations, Armenians, Persians, Massagetans, Ethiopians, and Greeks, (see the testimonies in Bochart's *Hieroz.* i. *lib.* 2, *c.* 10), yet the Israelites certainly received this religious practice first with the proper sun-worship, from upper Asia through the Assyrian, so that by the מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה can only be understood Ahaz, Manasseh, and Amon. The horses consecrated to the sun were not merely *picti aut sculpti* or *equorum quadrigarumque fusae imagines* (Selden *de diis Syr.* ii. 8), but real horses, as Corn. a Lap., Boch., and others have rightly concluded from the circumstance, that they were not burned or broken together with the chariots, but merely removed, (וַיִּשְׂרֹף). But whether, according to the uniform statement of the Rabbins (Jarchi, Kimchi, Levi Gers.), they were only dedicated to the sun, and were kept to meet the rising sun, or, as Boch. and many expositors conjecture, were also slain, as offerings to the sun, cannot be certainly determined. Probably the former only was the case.—The words מִבֹּא בֵית יְהוָה וגו׳ are variously conceived. De Wette renders: "that they came no more into the house of the Lord into the chamber of Nathan-melech the eunuch, who dwelt in the suburbs." Decidedly wrong; for וַיִּשְׂרֹף needs no stricter determination, as appears from v. 5 and from the thing itself. If the horses consecrated to the sun were removed it is manifest of itself they could no longer come into the temple. Others render: "from the entrance into the house of the Lord to the chamber of Nathan-melech," wherein it is pre-supposed either that the horses were kept loose within

this space, or that their stables were there. The words are connected not with וַיִּשְׁבֹּת but with נָתְנוּ, and are to be rendered: *ab introitu domus Jovae in cellulam etc.*, that is, from the temple-entrance, or on the side of the temple entrance, into the chamber . . . . The horses were quartered in the chamber of Nathan-melech. The chamber which obtained its name from Nathan-melech, a courtier not otherwise known, perhaps its builder, was בַּפַּרְוָרִים, that is, not in the suburbs, but in the outer court of the temple. Ges. (*thes.* ii. 1123) rightly identifies פרורים with פַּרְבַּר, 1 Chr. xxvi. 18, and understands it *de parte quadam atriorum templi Salomonei*, or of open halls, *porticus apertae, quae templi atria cingebant, ex quibus introitus erat in cellulas.* But the etymology and primary meaning are still doubtful. Böttcher (Proben p. 347) understands פרורים, פרבר of a "suburb-like separate building;" Ges. *l. c.* explains it from the Persian.—V. 12. The altars erected on the roof of the *alijah* of Ahaz, which were consecrated to the Lord of heaven (Zeph. i. 5; Jer. xix. 13, xxxii. 29), can only have been built by Ahaz, and, as Hezekiah in his religious reform would scarcely allow them to remain, must have been restored by Manasseh and Amon. מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה is to be understood as in v. 11. Concerning the altars built by Manasseh in the two courts of the temple see on xxi. 5. וַיָּרֶץ מִשָּׁם "he broke them off, destroyed them from thence;" יָרַץ from רצץ, not from רוּץ "he ran from thence" (S. Schm., de Wette, and others.)—On the high places mentioned v. 13 comp. on 1 Ki. xi. 5—8. It is to be observed that here not destruction but only defilement (טִמֵּא) of the במות is mentioned, from which it is plain that the altars erected by Solomon to the gods of his wives were no longer extant in the time of Josiah, but only the high places (במות), earth or stone heaps, on which, perhaps, the superstitious people still occasionally burned incense and made offerings to the gods. הַר הַמַּשְׁחִית denotes at all events the mount of Olives on the east side of Jerusalem, even if משחית be variously explained, inasmuch as some connect it with מָשַׁח to anoint, *mons olivarum est mons* הַמְּשֻׁחָה *i.e. unctionis* (Jarchi, Cler., and others), others more correctly derive it from שָׁחַת to corrupt.

But מַשְׁחִית is here not *partic. hiph.*, as for example Ex. xii. 13, 23, ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, but a noun-form with מ = מַשְׁחֵת *corruptio*; comp. Hävern. Comm. on Dan. p. 427. The mount of Olives is called the mount of corruption on account of the idol altars built on it. The Vulg. renders *mons offensionis*; accordingly in ecclesiastical tradition the southern part of the mount of Olives still bears the name of the mount of offence.—V. 14 does not treat of the objects of Solomon's idolatry, but the still remaining idols removed by Josiah are here mentioned in order to close the description of that which this pious king did for the extirpation of all monuments of idolatry within the bounds of his kingdom. On מַצֵּבוֹת and אֲשֵׁרִים comp. vol. i. p. 240.

Vv. 15—20. Not content with having eradicated every remnant of idolatry from his own kingdom, Josiah proceeded to the territory of the former kingdom of the ten tribes, and in Bethel and the other cities of Samaria destroyed the altars and temples of the high places, burned the Asherim that were in them, and profaned these places of worship for ever by taking the bones of the priests of the high places from their graves, and burning them upon the destroyed בָּמוֹת,[1] as the man of God from Judah had

[1] Here the question may arise, by what right Josiah could eradicate idolatry in the cities of Samaria, as neither Bethel nor the remaining cities of the former kingdom of Israel were under his dominion. Many learned men, as Prideaux (Connexion i. p. 48) and Hess (Gesch. d. Kg. ii. p. 223 f.), think, that Josiah as vassal of the king of Assyria had a certain, not indeed unlimited dominion over this region, and might regard it in some measure as his territory, and this was the more readily conceded to him on the part of the Assyrians, as they were secure of his fidelity in regard to Egypt. But that Josiah was a vassal of the Assyrians can neither be inferred from the release of Manasseh from his imprisonment in Babylon, nor proved from any other historical testimony. There is more probability in the remark of Jahn (bibl. Archaeol. ii. 1, p. 195), that the remaining Israelites could not resist the designs of Josiah, because their masters, the kings of Assyria, were involved in dangerous wars, partly with the invading Scythians, partly with Nabopolassar, who had shortly before ascended the throne of Babylon. Meanwhile the circumstance, that before the eighteenth year of Josiah the Levites had collected contributions from the remaining Israelites for the repair of the temple, rather presupposes a friendly relation of the Israelites to the kingdom of Judah, so that Josiah might extend his reform over the former Israelitish territory, not against their will by force, but with the consent if not of all, yet of

predicted to Jeroboam, 1 Ki. xiii.—V. 16. אֲשֶׁר שָׁמּ בָּהָר "that were there in the mount," that is, the mount at Bethel, on which now lies the village Singil, see p. 325 f.—V. 17. צִיּוּן a monument, here a tomb stone, comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1156.—The words אֲשֶׁר־בָּא מִשֹּׁמְרוֹן (v. 18) are to be explained according to אֲשֶׁר־בָּא מִיהוּדָה (v. 17); they denote merely the coming from the land of Israel (Samaria), from an undefined part of the kingdom of the ten tribes, from which that old prophet came to Bethel, and was buried there. On v. 17, 18, comp. 1 Ki. xiii. 26—32.

Vv. 21—23. On this Josiah ordered a passover festival, in which not merely his own subjects, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Judah, and Benjamin should take part, but the surviving remnant of the tribes of Israel (2 Chr. xxxv. 18) should appear in Jerusalem. This festival is described more fully and circumstantially in 2 Chr. xxxv. 1—19, both in respect to that which the king and his nobles did for the celebration of it, and with regard to the zeal displayed by the priests and Levites in its preparation. This festival was undertaken so solemnly and so exactly according to the precept of the law, that the historian remarks of it: such a passover was not holden from the days of the judges, or during the whole time of the kings. The older interpreters have rightly observed, that earlier passover festivals are not denied in this remark. *Dicendum*—says for example S. Schm.—*quod istorum* (that is, of David and other pious kings) *etiam tempore Pascha non intermissum, non tamen tanta frequentia et ritu publico Hierosolymis et exacte juxta legem factum sit.* Cler. has given prominence to the last point alone, when he says: *crediderim hoc velle scriptorem sacrum, per tempora regum nunquam ab omnibus, secundum omnes leges Mosaicas tam accurate Pascha cele-*

the better disposed majority of the Israelites, the remainder of whom, together with the heathen colonists, must have acquiesced. To assume such a friendly approximation of the Israelites remaining in the country to Judah, involves no improbability, as it is known, that at a subsequent period the Samaritans wished to take part in the building of the temple under Zerubbabel. But their Assyrian sovereigns were unable to oppose either this approximation or the proceedings of Josiah, as the Assyrian empire was at that time approaching its fall, if not already subjugated by the Chaldeans and Medes.

bratum fuisse. Consuetudinem antea, etiam sub piis regibus, videntur secuti potius quam ipsa verba legis; quod cum fit, multa necessario mutantur ac negliguntur. Sed inventi nuper libri verba attendi diligentissime voluit Josias. Even the pious Hezekiah in the passover celebrated by him must of necessity have deviated in many points from the law of Moses; comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 399 f.—Instead of, "from the days of the Judges who judged Israel," (v. 22), in 2 Chr. xxxv. 18, it is, "from the days of Samuel the prophet," who it is well known closed the period of the judges.

V. 24. In conclusion it is stated, that Josiah put away from the land the necromancers and teraphim, and all other traces of idolatry in order to raise (הָקִים) the discovered book of the law to full legitimate authority. Concerning אֹבוֹת and יִדְּעֹנִים comp. on xxi. 6. תְּרָפִים are not middle gods, serving for the investigation of the future, which might be set up in connexion with every system of religion (Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 177, and iii. p. 129), but family gods, to which were attached notions of a blessing proceeding magically from them to their possessors, Penates, which the ancestors of the Israelites brought with them from Mesopotamia, which were admitted into Hebraism from the time of the judges, and connected with the worship of Jehovah, and first became oracle-speaking gods by being associated (Judg. xvii. 5) with the ephod, the robe of the high priest, "inasmuch as the more general older notion of their magic power passed into the more special one of their soothsaying efficacy;" comp. Hävern. Comm. on Ezekiel, p. 347 ff. In this sense are the תרפים named here and Ezek. xxi. 16; Zech. x. 2. The name is connected with تَرَفَ *bonis commodisque vitae affluxit;* comp. Häv. p. 349.

Vv. 25—27. After our author has described Josiah's zealous labours for the restoration of the true worship of the Lord, he adds a general judgment concerning the real conversion of this king to the Lord, but immediately annexes to it the farther remark, that the Lord did not cease from his great anger kindled against Judah by the sins of Manasseh, but announced the determination to cast out Judah from his sight, as he had cast Israel

and to withdraw his grace from Jerusalem, the chosen city, as well as from the temple, which was designed to be the place of revealing his presence. This introduces not only the end of the reign of Josiah, but at the same time the end of the kingdom of Judah henceforth hastening with rapid steps to its fall.—V. 25. The formula, with which Hezekiah's piety was described (xviii. 3), that his like was not among all kings, is here applied to Josiah's sincere conversion to the Lord according to the law of Moses. The description, "with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might," contains the law of love to the Lord, Deut. vi. 5, comp. Luk. x. 27.—V. 26. עַל כָּל־הַנְּעָסִים "because of all the provocations with which Manasseh had provoked him." Manasseh is named here, in xxiv. 3 and Jer. xv. 4, as the one who, by his idolatry and wickedness, brought the Divine sentence inevitably on Jerusalem and Judah, not as the only godless king of Judah, but as the one who pushed his godlessness to the greatest extreme, so that the genuine repentance of the people was no longer possible. By the zeal of the pious Josiah, indeed, the external worship of idols was abolished, and the people assented to the covenant made with the Lord, but they did not turn to the Lord with all their heart. *Quamvis enim rex religiosissimus esset populusque metu ei pareret, propterea tamen animus populi non erat mutatus, ut satis liquet ex castigationibus Jeremiae, Sophoniae et aliorum prophetarum, qui circa haec tempora et paulo post vaticinati sunt.* Cler. Jeremiah particularly discloses the deep degradation and gross moral corruption of the people during and after Josiah's reformation of religion, in the first ten chapters of his prophecies, which contain a recapitulation of his prophetic activity under Josiah (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 1, p. 209 ff.) The sentence of Judah's rejection already announced to Manasseh himself (xxi. 16 ff.) could not therefore be averted by Josiah. On v. 27 comp. xvii. 20 and 23.

Vv. 28—30. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 20—27. Towards the end of Josiah's reign the catastrophe began to unfold itself, by which the kingdom of Judah was to be overturned, when the Egyptian king Nechoh entered upon his expedition to the Euphrates. On his march through Palestine Josiah encountered him, but lost his life in the battle of Megiddo, and was carried dead to Jeru-

salem, and there laid in his grave בְּשָׁלוֹם (xxii. 20.) This event, which is very briefly stated in our narrative, is more fully and particularly related in Chronicles i. p. q.; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 431 f.—The Egyptian king Nechoh (נְכֹה or נְכוֹ Jer. xlvi. 2 and 2 Chr. xxxv. 20), called in the LXX., by Josephus (Antiq. x. 5, 1), and Manetho in Jul. Afric. and Euseb., *Νεχαώ*, by Herod. ii. 158 f., iv. 42, and Diodor. Sic. i. 33, *Νεκώς*, was, according to Manetho, the sixth king of the twenty-sixth or second Saitic dynasty, the second Pharaoh of the name, the son of Psammitichus and grandson of Nechoh I., and, according to Herodotus, celebrated for a canal which he caused to be dug in order to connect the Nile with the Red Sea, as well as for the circumnavigation of Africa; comp. Winer R.W. ii. p. 172 f. and Ges. *thes.* ii. 885.—By the "king of Assyria," whom Nechoh calls his hereditary foe (בֵּית מִלְחַמְתִּי 2 Chr. xxxv. 21) can only be understood here Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, who put an end to the Assyrian monarchy by the destruction of Nineveh, and had transferred the sovereignty hitherto exercised by Assyria over upper Asia to the Babylonians or Chaldeans. He is called king of Assyria, because he ruled the Assyrian empire. In the same sense Jeremiah (ii. 8) uses אַשּׁוּר for בָּבֶל.[1]

[1] Wilh. Hupfeld (*exercitt. Herodot.* i. p. 7) has indeed cursorily inferred from our author, that the Assyrian empire was at that time still standing; others, for example Ges. *thes.* ii. 882 and Hitzig in his preliminary remarks on Nahum, have concluded from Herodotus, that Nineveh was conquered and destroyed in the interval between 606—597 B.C., or even later. But our author affords no proof of this, and as to the account of Herod. i. 103 and 106, that Cyaxares in his first attempt upon Nineveh was prevented from conquering it by the invasion of the Scythians, and only after the Scythian dominion over Asia, which lasted twenty-eight years, began anew the siege of the Assyrian capital, conquered Nineveh and put an end to the Assyrian empire, it is at the same time assumed in it, that Cyaxares became king of Medea in the year 633, so that, if we place his first attempt against Nineveh between 633 and 625, the conquest of it occurring twenty-eight years later cannot have been earlier than between 605 and 597. But this opinion concerning the beginning of the reign of Cyaxares rests again on the presumption that Cyrus was twenty-nine years king over the Medes, and therefore ascended the Median throne in 558, whereas Herod. i. 214 merely says: *βασιλεύσας τὰ πάντα ἐνὸς δέοντα τριήκοντα ἔτεα*, which we must necessarily understand of the time when he became king of the Persians, as according to Xenoph., Cyrop., Cyax-

Since Josiah marched against the Egyptian king and encoun-

ares (II.) was king in Media after the conquest of Babylon, and then first gave him his daughter to wife and with her the right of succession in Media (*Cyrop.* viii. 5, 18 f.), but Cyrus, according to Euseb. *Chron. arm.* i. p. 21, ruled over Babylonia only nine years, and according to Xenoph. Cyrop. viii. 7, 1, died in the seventh year of his reign (that is, of his sole sovereignty over the Babylonio-Medo-Persian kingdom after the death of Cyaxares). But even if we overlook the contradiction in which Herodotus is involved with Xenophon and the Bible, which recognizes Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages, under the name of Darius Medus, as sovereign of the Chaldean kingdom (Dan. ix. 1), inasmuch as he makes the sovereignty of the Medes to cease with Astyages, and is totally silent about the son of Astyages, Cyaxares II., yet the two-fold siege of Nineveh by Cyaxares (I.), mentioned by Herodotus, together with the intervening twenty-eight years' domination of the Scythians, cannot be placed in the interval between 630 and 600, or even later, because the Lydian war of Cyaxares, which was terminated by the solar eclipse foretold by Thales, and occurring, according to the investigations of Ideler and Waltmann (see Ideler Hdb. d. Chronol. i. p. 209), in 610, falls not before but after the end of the Scythian dominion, and in all probability only after the conquest of Nineveh, as the Scythians, when they gave occasion to this war, appear no longer as masters, but rather as servants and adherents of Cyaxares, and Labynetus (Nabopolassar) of Babylon intervenes as mediator, for which purpose an Assyrian deputy would scarcely have been selected (Herod. i. 73 and 74 comp. with 106.) But had the twenty-eight years' dominion of the Scythians already ceased in 610, Cyaxares, under whom it should have begun, must have come to the sovereignty a considerable time before 633. Accordingly, the accounts of Herodotus concerning Cyaxares prove to be of no avail to determine the year, in which, with the destruction of Nineveh, the Assyrian empire fell; and, as from the biblical statements it only appears with certainty that Nineveh was destroyed before the year 606, comp. Delitzch on Habak. p. xix., we are left merely to the scanty notices of Alex. Polyhistor and Abydenus compared with the canon of Ptolemy. According to Abydenus, in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 25, the last Assyrian king Saracus, on the intelligence that hostile troops were advancing to his kingdom from the sea, sent his general Busalosor to Babylon; but the latter here formed the determination to rebel against him, betrothed Amuhia, the daughter of the Median prince Asdahages, to his son Nabucodrosor, and soon after made an assault upon Nineveh, in consequence of which Saracus set fire to his palace. Still more scanty is the notice of Alex. Polyhistor in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 20, that Sardanapalus, who ruled over the Chaldeans twenty-one years, sent auxiliaries to the prince and satrap of the Median nation, *videlicet ut filio suo Nabucodrossoro desponderet Amuhiam e filiabus Asdahagis unam.* That Polyh. here calls Nabopolassar Sardanapalus, has been already noticed by Syncellus (i. 396 ed. Dind.), who farther adds: οὗτος (Nabopolassar)

tered him at Megiddo (in the plain of Esdraelon, see above p. 48), Nechoh must have come by sea to Palestine and landed at Acco; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 436 f. This is confirmed by Herodotus, inasmuch as to the account that Nechoh built ships (*αἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ βορηΐῃ θαλάσσῃ ἐποιήθησαν—naves in mare septentrionale s. mediterraneum mittendas cf.* Bähr *ad. h. l.)* he adds: *καὶ ταύτῃσί τε ἐχρᾶτο ἐν τῷ δέοντι· καὶ Σύροισι πεζῇ ὁ Νεκὼς συμβαλὼν ἐν Μαγδόλῳ ἐνίκησε* (ii. 159.) These words show, as Kalkar, Critical essay on the last times of kingdom of Judah in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. ii. 2, p. 79, has justly remarked, that the arrival was by sea, but the battle took place on land.—"He slew him at Megiddo, when he saw him." Cler. explains כִּרְאֹתוֹ אֹתוֹ rightly according to the sense, *prœlio cum eo commisso,* comp. xiv. 8, where the *hithp.* הִתְרָאֶה is used in a similar sense. This brief notice of our verse is elucidated in the detailed narrative of this event in 2 Chr. xxxv. 21 f. by the fact, that Josiah, when he gave battle to Nechoh, notwithstanding his declaration that he should not contend with him, as he took the field, not against him, but against his hereditary foe (the Babylonian as heir of the Assyrian kingdom), was hit by the Egyptian archers and mortally wounded, so that when he was brought from his war chariot into his other chariot, and carried to Jerusalem, he expired by the way. The reason why Josiah did not desist from the war after such a declaration from Nechoh is not to be sought in this, that he was under the dominion of Babylon, but merely in the fact that he cherished the conviction that he could not remain neutral in the war that was breaking out

στρατηγὸς ὑπὸ Σάρακος τοῦ Χαλδαίων βασιλέως σταλεὶς, κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σάρακος εἰς Νίνον ἐπιστρατεύει· οὗ τὴν ἔφοδον πτοηθεὶς ὁ Σάρακος ἑαυτὸν σὺν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐνέπρησε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν Χαλδαίων καὶ Βαβυλῶνος παρέλαβεν ὁ αὐτὸς Ναβοπαλάσαρος, ὁ του Ναβουχοδονόσωρ πατήρ. From these brief notices this at least is manifest, that Busalosor or Nabopolassar was a general of the last Assyrian king, and was sent by him to Babylon, but here joined with the Median prince, rebelled against his master, and by the conquest of Nineveh made an end of the Assyrian monarchy. Now, if the canon of Ptolemy represents Nabopolassar as among the Assyrian and Median kings, and, in accordance with Polyhistor, assigns to him twenty-one years, the beginning of his reign can only be placed in the year 625 B.C., coinciding with the end of the Assyrian monarchy, and therefore the conquest of Nineveh not later than this year.

between Babylon and Egypt, and perhaps hoped by the defeat and conquest of the Egyptians to avert further evil from his country and kingdom. For in the desire for conquest which distinguished the two nations, it was not difficult to foresee that the kingdom of Judah, lying between the two hostile powers, would inevitably be swallowed up by the conqueror. With this conviction Josiah took the field and sank under the Divine decree, to which reference is made in the words 2 Chr. xxxv. 22, "he hearkened not unto the words of Nechoh from the mouth of God."—Instead of Megiddo Herod. *l. c.* calls the place of the battle *Μάγδολον*, confounding the two names with one another, as with most expositors even Forbiger, Hdb. d. a. Geogr. ii. p. 695 thinks probable, but in p. 798 in contradiction with himself takes *Μάγδολον* to be the same with מִגְדֹּל, Ex. xiv. 2, situated twelve Roman miles south of Pelusium, and without reflecting on the impossibility of this assertion adds, that Nechoh there smote the Syrians.—The death of the pious Josiah was deeply lamented by his whole people; Jeremiah composed lamentations for him (2 Chr. xxxv. 24 f.), which however have not come down to us, and the mourning of the people was so great, that it was used as a proverb even after the exile to denote the deepest mourning, comp. Zech. xii. 11 and my apol. Vers. p. 432.—His younger son Jehoahaz was chosen[1] by the people as king in his stead, and because he was not the legitimate successor anointed as sovereign (comp. above p. 12.)

[1] Jeremiah calls king Jehoahaz (xxii. 11) Shallum, שַׁלֻּם, that is, the requited, in order to indicate the fortune that befell him. Jehoahaz, that is, he whom the Lord should hold, became a Shallum, one to whom the Lord had requited the evil of his doings, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 540. This designation cannot therefore be regarded as the actual name borne by Jehoahaz. It is found indeed in 1 Chr. iii. 15, but there (v. 16) Jehoiachin also is mentioned only under the name Jechoniah applied to him by Jeremiah, and Josiah's sons Eliakim and Zedekiah; from which it is manifest, that the writer of Chronicles herein follows the prophet Jeremiah.

CHAPTER XXIII. 31—XXIV. 17.

REIGN OF KING JEHOAHAZ, VV. 31—35, OF JEHOIAKIM, V. 36—CH. XXIV. 7, AND JEHOIACHIN, VV. 8—17.

Vv. 31—35. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 1—4. Three months' reign of Jehoahaz. Why the people passed over Eliakim, who was twenty-five years of age, and elected Jehoahaz, the younger son of Josiah, who was twenty-three years old, king, is not mentioned, probably on account of his warlike character, by which they considered him better fitted to be sovereign than Jehoiakim. From Jer. xxii. 10—12 it appears, that the people formed great hopes of him, that they expected him as a vigorous sovereign to repel the danger threatening the kingdom from Pharoah, and on that account lamented very much his removal to Egypt. As sovereign he was not like his pious father, but followed the steps of the earlier untheocratic kings; "he did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, as all his fathers had done." The prophet Ezekiel compares him to a young lion, that learned to catch the prey and devoured men; but as soon as the nations heard of him, he was taken in their pit and brought with nose rings to Egypt (xix. 3 f.) and characterizes him as a tyrant inclined to deeds of violence; Josephus (Ant. x. 5, 2) designates him therefore as *ἀσεβὴς καὶ μιαρὸς τὸν τρόπον*.—V. 33. "And Pharaoh Nechoh put him in fetters at Riblah in the land of Hamath, when he was king in Jerusalem." Instead of this in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 3 it is, "And the king of Egypt removed him at Jerusalem." The contradiction which Schmeidler (d. Untergang des R. Juda. 1831, p. 58 ff.) observed between these two passages, Cler. *ad 2 Chr. l.c.* removed by the just remark: *Jerosolima prius amoveri oportuit Jehoachazum, quam in vincula conjici; nec quidquam vetat Jerosolimæ prius solio dejectum quam Riblam abductum.* The Masoretic change of בְּמָל֫וֹךְ into מִמָּל֫וֹךְ is an unnecessary conjecture; and בְּמָל֫וֹךְ בִּירוּשָׁלִַם is not to be explained with Cler. *dum Jerosolimitani eum pro rege haberent*, but

the strangeness of the expression arises from the unusal connection of the history, inasmuch as our author has omitted to state, that Nechoh came to Jerusalem and there removed Jehoahaz from the throne and seated on it his elder brother Jehoiakim. Many indeed have denied the taking of Jerusalem by Nechoh, but quite erroneously; for this event is not merely testified by 2 Chr. xxxvi. 3, but confirmed also by Herodotus,[1] and besides has in itself the highest degree of probability. For even if we were to assume with J. D. Mich. and others, that the elder brother Eliakim, dissatisfied with the election of Jehoahaz as king, had applied to Nechoh at Riblah to recover through him his paternal throne, yet Jehoahaz could not have been so foolish as at the mere command of Nechoh at Riblah to submit to the enemy of his country and abdicate the sovereignty, when he was perfectly safe in Jerusalem, because the people had raised him to the throne. If Pharaoh wished to interfere in the internal affairs of the kingdom of Judah, he would not proceed, after the battle of Megiddo, from Palestine to Syria, but must first at Jerusalem have deposed Jehoahaz, who was raised to the throne without his consent (comp. Kalk. i. p. q. p. 83.) We must, therefore, conceive the course of events somewhat thus: Nechoh, on the intelligence of the accession of Jehoahaz to the throne, and perhaps also in consequence of the complaint which Eliakim brought before him in regard to this matter, set out with a part of his forces to Jerusalem, while the remainder of his troops pursued their way at leisure towards Riblah, took Jerusalem and captured king Jehoahaz, laid a tribute on the country, raised Eliakim as his vassal to the throne, and on his departure brought Jehoahaz captive with him to Riblah, where he put him in chains and car-

[1] Comp. Herod. ii. 159: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην (the above mentioned battle at Megiddo) Κάδυτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίης ἐοῦσαν μεγάλην εἷλε. That Jerusalem is to be understood by Κάδυτις the most eminent modern theologians, philologists, and historians admit, the names of whom are enumerated in my apol. Vers. p. 434. I have there (p. 433—439) refuted both the opinion advocated by Hitzig in his *Dissert. de Cadyte urbe Herod. Gott.* 1829, that Κάδυτις denotes the Philistine city Gaza, and the conclusions drawn from it by this learned man and adopted by Schmeidler i. p. q. p. 54 ff. against the taking of Jerusalem by Nechoh, and I have not yet heard of any protest against this refutation.

ried him to Egypt.[1]—Riblah in the land of Hamath, situated according to Num. xxxiv. 11 on the north east border of Palestine, is preserved "in the present Riblah, a village ten or twelve hours S.S.W. of Hums (Emesa) on the river el Asy (Orontes) in the northern part of the great valley el Bukaa" (comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 747.) It thus lay on the great caravan road, which led from Palestine by Damascus, Emesa, and Hamath, to Thapsacus and Carchemish on the Euphrates, on which account, perhaps, Nebuchadnezzar made it his head-quarters in his last expedition against Judea, comp. xxv. 6, 20, 21; Jer. xxxix. 5, lii. 10.—A hundred talents of silver are, according to Bertheau's computation, 261,800 pr. rixd. (about £34,217); a talent of gold, according to Michaelis' reckoning, amounts to 4412 ducats (about £5475.)—V. 34. "And Pharaoh Nechoh made Eliakim, the son of Josiah, king in the room of Josiah his father." These last words indicate that Nechoh did not acknowledge the sovereignty of Jehoahaz, namely, because he was elected by the people without his concurrence. "And turned his name to Jehoiakim." The change of name is a sign of dependence of the loss of his freedom. In ancient times princes were wont to give the persons who entered into their services, as masters their slaves, new names, comp. Gen. xli. 45; Ezr. v. 14; Dan. i. 7, and the documents quoted by Havern. on this passage. But whereas heathen princes were fond of giving those who entered into their service as slaves heathen names after their deities, Eliakim and Mattaniah (xxiv. 17) receive the purely Israelitish names Jehoiakim, Jehovah will establish, and Zidkijahu, the righteousness of Jehovah. Hence we may infer with certainty that Nechoh and Nebuchadnezzar treated the vassal kings appointed by them not altogether as slaves, but permitted them to choose themselves the new names, which they only confirmed in token of their supre-

[1] The older expositors mostly assumed that Nechoh, after the battle of Megiddo, advanced without delay to the Euphrates, and took Carchemish, and only on his return thence came to Jerusalem, deposed Jehoahaz, and appointed Jehoiakim king. But the improbability, indeed impossibility, of this assumption has been shown by J. D. Mich., who pointed out, that Carchemish was from 400 to 500 miles from Megiddo, so that within three months an army could not possibly make its way thither, conquer the fenced city Carchemish, and then march back a still greater distance to Jerusalem and take this city.

macy. On the change of Eliakim (God will establish) into Jehoiakim, Hengstenb. (Christol. iii. p. 540) aptly remarks, that Eliakim so changed the name given him by his father with reference to the promise 2 Sam. vii. 12, "and I will establish (וַהֲקִימֹתִי) thy seed after thee," etc., that he put it in still closer connection with the promise in which not El but Jehovah is expressly named as the promiser, and adopted this change not from piety but out of opposition to the sentence of the prophets concerning the impending fall of the royal house of David.—V. 35. In order to raise the tribute demanded by Nechoh Jehoiakim laid a tax on the land and exacted of the people, according to the assessment of each, the requisite silver and gold. הֶעֱרִיךְ means here to assess, as Lev. xxvii. 8, 12. נָגַשׂ to press, to exact a debt or payment from any one, *cum acc. pers.* Deut. xv. 3, is here at the same time construed *cum acc. rei.*

V. 36—Ch. xxiv. 7. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 5—8. Reign of Jehoiakim; first invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. V. 36. Rumah the place, from which Zebidah the mother of Jehoiakim came, is quite unknown; perhaps רוּמָה is the same with אֲרוּמָה (Judg. ix. 41) in the neighbourhood of Shechem.—V. 37, Jehoiakim as regent. is characterized like Jehoahaz (v. 32); whence we perceive that they shared the same ungodly disposition; Jehoahaz only failed in time to display his ungodliness on the throne, as Jehoiakim did during his reign of eleven years, whom Jeremiah, xxii. 13 ff., characterizes as an unrighteous prince enriching himself by the unjust oppression of his people, "whose eyes and heart were directed to nothing but gain and innocent blood to shed it, and to oppression and violence to do it;" comp. xxiv. 4, and Jer. xxvi. 22 f. Josephus designates him accordingly as *τὴν φύσιν ἄδικος καὶ κακοῦργος, καὶ μήτε πρὸς Θεὸν ὅσιος, μήτε πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιεικής* (Ant. x. 5, 2).

Ch. xxiv. 1. "In his days Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came up, and Jehoiakim became subject to him three years; then he revolted again from him." Henceforward the accounts in our narrative, as well as in Chronicles, are extremely concise, being limited to that which is indispensably necessary to represent the fall of the kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar, written נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר or נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר Jer. xxi. 2, 7, xxii. 25, etc., *Ναβουχοδονόσορ*

LXX. *Ναβουχοδονόσορος* in Berosus in Joseph. Ant. x. 11, 1, and still otherwise, according to the explanation of Gesenius, *Mercurii rex princeps* (comp. on the different orthographies and explanations of the name Ges. *thes.* ii. 840), was the son of Nabopolassar, the founder of the Chaldee monarchy, and reigned, according to Berosus in *Josephi c. Ap.* i. 20, Alex. Polyh. in *Eusebii Chron. arm.* p. 21, and the canon of Ptolemy, forty-three years, from 604 to 561 B.C. His campaign against Jehoiakim here recorded falls in the fourth year of the latter's reign, that is, 606 B.C., thus properly before the beginning of his reign. This appears from Jer. xxv. 1, comp. with xlvi. 2, and from Berosus. The prophet Jeremiah xxv. announces the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar in such a manner that it must have taken place in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 21 f. In the same year, according to Jer. xlvi. 2, Nebuchadnezzar totally defeated the Egyptian king Nechoh at Carchemish (Circesium) on the Euphrates. But Berosus relates in a passage quoted by Joseph. (*Ant.* x. 11, 1, and *c. Ap.* i. 19), that Nabopolassar, on the intelligence of the revolt of his satraps over Egypt, Cœlesyria and Phenicia, being no longer able from age to bear the hardships of war, made over a part of his army to his still youthful son, and sent him against them; that Nebuchadnezzar conquered them in battle, and reduced this country again under his dominion; that, meanwhile, Nabopolassar fell sick and died in Babylon, whereupon Nebuchadnezzar, on receiving intelligence of his death, hastened with a few followers through the wilderness to Babylon, and ordered his army, after regulating the affairs of Egypt and the other countries, to follow at leisure with the prisoners and heavy troops. From this narrative, notwithstanding much unhistorical embellishment,[1] thus much is

[1] To these embellishments belongs, for example, the motive assigned for this expedition of Nebuchadnezzar, the revolt of the satraps placed over Egypt, Cœlesyria and Phenicia, inasmuch as Berosus here, according to the just remark of J. D. Mich., "speaks the arrogant language of the annals of the Asiatic monarchies, who regard all other nations as subjects, as the Chinese, if perchance a European embassy arrive, notify in their annals that they paid tribute." With this compare what Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 103 ff.) has remarked upon the encomiastic character of the accounts of Berosus concerning the Chaldeans and Nebuchadnezzar in particular. To take statements of a

elicited as certain fact, that Nebuchadnezzar, before the death of his father, not merely defeated the Egyptians, but penetrated to the borders of Egypt. But that in this first expedition against hither Asia, which was terminated by the intelligence of his father's decease, he also took Jerusalem, appears partly from Dan. i. 1 ff., partly from our verse and the parallel passage, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6.[1] For without the taking of Jerusalem he could not make king Jehoiakim his subject, still less bind him in chains in order to carry him to Babylon. Farther, that the taking of the city occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim and not later, we do not require to prove from Dan. i. 1 ff., especially as this passage is not pointed enough for this purpose, because here, probably according to a somewhat different computation of the years of Jehoiakim's reign, the third year of this king is named as the

similar kind, that are in contradiction with otherwise accredited facts, for historical truth, and with Schroeer (*regn. Babyl.* p. 289 ff.) and others to form conjectures concerning these satraps, or with Winer (R.W. ii. p. 169) to assume on this account a defect in history, is to misapprehend the spirit of the old extra-biblical historians, who uniformly proceed upon the principle of glorifying their heroes at the expense of historical truth. Hengstenb. i. p. q., and in his *comment. de reb. Tyr.* p. 35 f., has collected abundant proofs of this. To the unhistorical exaggerations belongs also the notice of the regulating of the affairs of Egypt, which was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar at a much later period.

[1] This passage indeed (2 Chr. xxxvi. 6) is referred by many ancient and modern expositors, even by Kalkar i. p. q. p. 89, to the second expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jehoiakim, but quite erroneously. For this reference, even without regard to the consideration that his first expedition against Judah, with which the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah began, would not in that case be mentioned in Chronicles, which cannot be conceived possible on account of 2 Chr. xxxvi. 21, is proved to be false by this, that Nebuchadnezzar came no more to Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's lifetime, but the second time only under Jehoiachin. The correct view of our passage is found among others in Schroeer, who, *l.c.* p. 282 f., has thus simply collected the various biblical statements: *Vix propheta Jeremias Jehojakimo, a Pharaone Neco in solium evecto, periculum a Nebucadnezare imminere prænunciaverat (c. 25), cum ille eodem adhuc anno adveniens regnum Judaicum sub jugum mitteret. Equidem Nebucadnezar regem catenis vinctum ad perpetuos carceres damnaverat, pactis tamen servitutis conditionibus, mutata sententia eundem in regnum utcunque restituebat, nonnullis saltem ex sobole regia cum vasis sacris Babylonem abductis* (2 *Reg.* xxiv. 1 *sqq.*, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6 *sqq.* With this comp. also my apol. Vers. p. 24 and 440 f.

year of the conquest; on the contrary, it follows from the natural course of events. After the defeat of Nechoh at Circesium Nebuchadnezzar would no doubt avail himself of his advantage pursue the fleeing enemy, and forthwith subject to himself the countries occupied by them, among which Judea was included. But for the march from Circesium to Jerusalem he required at most only two or three months, so that he might very well conquer Jerusalem in the same year in which he defeated the Egyptians at Carchemish. This probability is made a certainty by Jer. xxxvi. 9. The fast proclaimed according to this passage in the ninth month of the fifth year of Jehoiakim, to which all the people came from the cities of Judah to Jerusalem, was instituted for no other purpose than to commemorate the taking of Jerusalem the year before, with which the seventy years' Babylonian servitude of the Jews commenced, as also after the exile the anniversaries of the various great catastrophes in the fall of the kingdom of Judah were observed as fasts (comp. Zech. vii. 3—5, viii. 19, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 426.)[1] Jerusalem therefore was taken the first time by Nebuchadnezzar in the ninth month of the 4th year of Jehoiakim, that is, in December 606 B.C.[2*] Comp. also Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 52 ff., and my apol. Vers, p. 19 ff.

[1] The supposition of Hitzig, Begr. d. Krit. p. 183, Schmeidler i. p. q. p. 84, Maurer on Jer. xxxvi. 9, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 700, that this fast was proclaimed from fear of the army of the Chaldeans when first approaching, I have already refuted in my apol. Vers. p. 25.

[2] Following Josephus (*Ant.* x. 6—1) Winer, R.W. i. p. 700, and ii. p. 170, and Kalkar i. p. q. p. 88 f. assume, that Nebuchadnezzar in his first progress did not touch Judea, but first invaded this land four years later, and made Jehoiakim subject to him. But this statement of Josephus is founded on no historical source now accessible to us, but merely on an erroneous exposition of the passages in Kings and Chronicles which relate to the point in question. The date, "in the fourth" year of Nebuchadnezzar, which was the eighth of Jehoiakim," Josephus has drawn from vv. 1—6 of our chapter, compared with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, and Jer. xxii. 19. For as from the prediction of Jeremiah (xxii. 19), that Jehoiakim should be buried as an ass, etc., he drew the conclusion, that Jehoiakim was slain by Nebuchadnezzar, and his body thrown over the city walls and left unburied, he was compelled to assume farther, that Jehoiakim rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar only at the end of his reign, according to which his subjection, if it lasted only three years, must have commenced in the eighth year of his reign. But how far Josephus is from inspiring confidence in these historical averments, which are in contradiction with Old Testament statements,

Vv. 2, 3. In order to punish the apostasy of Jehoiakim, the Lord sent bands of the Chaldees, Aramaeans, Moabites, and Ammonites against him, and against Judah to destroy it (לְהַאֲבִידוֹ.) From these words it is clear that Nebuchadnezzar himself was not in a position to punish the rebellion of Jehoiakim against his authority, at least immediately, probably because he was too much occupied with other affairs of the kingdom in the first years of his reign after his father's death. He therefore sent merely the forces that were in the neighbourhood of Judah against Jehoiakim. The hostile bands named, beside the Chaldees, were all perhaps already dependent on Nebuchadnezzar, so that they attacked Judah at his command in conjunction with the Chaldean troops that were left on the borders. How much

and how much rather these averments always rest on erroneous combinations and conclusions, an unprejudiced critjcism will, it is to be hoped, sooner or later come to be convinced, and will cease to award to the utterly uncritical Josephus the preference over the biblical writers. The Old Testament writers know nothing of the slaying of Jehoiakim by Nebuchadnezzar, nothing of an expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against him in the eleventh year of his reign (comp. my apol. Vers. p. 440), but relate that after Jehoiakim's revolt from the king of Babylon, the latter sent Chaldee, Aramaean, and other troops against him, but that Jehoiakim slept with his fathers, and his son Jehoiakim succeeded him on the throne, and that Nebuchadnezzar himself only in the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign advanced the second time against Jerusalem, conquered the city, and carried away to Babylon the king with his family, his nobles, the warriors and smiths (2 Ki. xxiv. 2—17); whereas Josephus fabulously reports that Nebuchadnezzar, after the slaying of Jehoiakim, carried away 3000 captives, among whom was Ezekiel, to Babylon, and appointed Jehoiakim's son Jehoiachin as king, but soon after repenting of this, sent a new army to Jerusalem and took Jehoiachin captive, and brought him to Babylon (*Ant.* x. 6—3 and 7—1.)—The statement of Josephus, that Nebuchadnezzar in his first campaign against hither Asia after the defeat of the Egyptians at the Euphrates did not touch Judea, but only took *τὴν ἄχρι Πηλουσίου Συρίαν παρὲξ τῆς Ἰουδαίας* is also contradicted by the account of Berosus quoted by Josephus himself in another place, and given above, inasmuch as Berosus not only knows nothing of this exception of Judah, but even expressly says, that Nebuchadnezzar carried away to Babylon *τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Φοινίκων καὶ Σύρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐθνῶν*; with which captives *Ἰουδαίων* Kalkar knows not what to do, and, contrary to all historic probability, wishes to understand the words of Jews who were compelled to serve in Nechoh's army.

they accomplished, however, is not definitely stated; but from the circumstance that after the death of Jehoiakim his son Jehoiachin ascended the throne (v. 6) this much may be inferred as certain, that they had not been able to conquer Jerusalem. But this chastisement was only a fulfilment of the Divine sentence pronounced by the prophets on the land and people of Judah for their sins; comp. v. 2 (end) and v. 3 with xxi. 10—15 and xxiii. 26 f. The sending of these enemies is therefore ascribed to Jehovah, who, as the supreme disposer of the destiny of the theocracy, punished Jehoiakim for his apostasy. For after Judah was given over by the Lord into the hands of the Chaldeans for the punishment of his apostasy and his surrender to the principles of heathenism, every rebellion against them appears as a rebellion against the Lord, which he punishes. Comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 500.—V. 4. Comp. xxi. 16. "And Jehovah would not pardon," namely, because the mass of the people, as is abundantly evident from the prophecies of the contemporary Jeremiah, were incorrigible, and could only be purified by the calamities of the exile, and the remnant brought to repentance. God therefore would (אָבָה) not and could not alter the decree for the rejection of Judah from his sight (xxiii. 27) because it rested on his very being, on his holiness and righteousness. God could not turn his heart to the godless people, even if the greatest intercessors, Moses and Samuel, had appeared before him (Jer. xv. 1 ff.)—V. 6. That the statement, "Jehoiakim slept with his fathers," is not inconsistent with the prediction, Jer. xxii. 19, "Jehoiakim will be buried like an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem," and xxxvi. 30, "his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the cold," is acknowledged even by Winer (R.W. i. p. 701), inasmuch as, approving of the conjecture offered by J. D. Mich. on 1 Chr. xxxvi. 6, he thinks that the maltreatment of the body of Jehoiakim announced by the prophet may have been practised on the remains of the hated king in the conquest of Jerusalem, that took place three months later, either by the conquerors out of revenge for his revolt, or perhaps even by his own subjects. But it is also possible, and perhaps still more probable, that Jehoiakim met with his death in a battle with the hostile forces

sent against him, and did not come to the grave, but was left lying unburied (comp. my apol. Vers. p. 441 f.): in which case still his son Jehoiachin might ascend the throne unimpeded, as Jerusalem was still in possession of the Jews.—V. 7. The notice concerning the Egyptian king Nechoh is given here according to S. Schm., *ut indicaretur casus Jojakimi; Jojakimus scil. fiducia Aegyptiorum rebellavit adversus Babylonium, et eos sibi venturos auxilio speravit, sed frustra.* In the highest degree improbable, as Nechoh had hitherto proved himself not the friend and ally but the foe of Judah. Much rather is the account, that Nechoh proceeded no more out of his land, because Nebuchadnezzar had taken from him all the territory from the brook of Egypt to the river Euphrates (which he had conquered), given, because Pharaoh's march to the Euphrates had been previously mentioned, and the reader at least expected an indication as to how Nechoh acted on the taking of Judah by the Chaldeans. The words moreover apply to Nechoh; for even if his immediate successor Psammis attempted nothing, yet Apries (Pharaoh Hophra) again endeavoured to make conquests and come to the aid of Zedekiah against the Chaldeans besieging Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvii. 5, xliv. 30; Ezek. xvii. 15—17.)

Vv. 8—17. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9, 10. The three months' reign of Jehoiachin, removal of the king with his mother, his wives, his courtiers, and the most powerful portion of the nation to Babylon.—V. 8. In the eighteenth year of his life (not the eighth, as it stands in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9 by an error of transcription), Jehoiachin[1] ascended the throne and held it only three months and two days (2 Chr. xxxvi. 9), as he pursued the ungodly principles of his father, "did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that his father had done" (v. 9.) Schmeidler indeed i. p. q. p. 108, and Kalkar i. p. q. p. 91, have asserted the contrary of his character. Jeremiah, says Schmeid-

[1] This name standing in obvious relation with 2 Sam. vii. 12 (יְכָנְיָתִי), Jeremiah changes into the equivalent form Jechoniah (Jer. xxiv. 1, xxvii. 20, xxviii. 4) in order to make from it the form Coniah (xxii. 24—28, xxxvii. 1) and thereby indicate the fate awaiting this sovereign. "The future is prefixed in order to be able to cut off hope by the aphæresis of the י, a Jechoniah without J, a God-will-establish without *will*. Comp. Hengstenb. Christ. iii. p. 541.

ler, considers Jehoiachin by no means so bad, as the authors of the second books of Kings and Chronicles do, and Kalkar remarks: "To this sovereign, who is also called Jechoniah and Coniah (Jer. xxii. 23) Josephus bears witness, that he was φύσει χρηστὸς ὢν καὶ δίκαιος; and also several intimations of sacred scripture speak for the excellent gifts of the prince, but he did not answer the expectations awakened by his gifts." But from the circumstance that he is compared, Jer. xxii. 24, to a signet ring, the most precious among the possessions of an Eastern man, and that the unbelieving Jews ask (v. 28), "is Coniah a despised broken vessel?" that does not follow, which Josephus inferred from it, that he was φύσει χρηστὸς καὶ δίκαιος. The entirely hypothetical asseveration, "As I live, saith the Lord, though Coniah were the signet on my right hand, yet would I pluck him thence," says nothing of the character of Jechoniah, neither that he was bad, nor that he was good; but contains merely the irrevocable Divine sentence of his being rejected and given over to the Chaldeans; and the question of the unbelieving Jews can prove still less, first, because it comes from unbelievers, and next, because it only expresses their astonishment at the ignominious lot that is announced to him. That Jehoiachin was no better than he is described in the historical books, appears from Ezek. xix. 5—7, where he is not only depicted like Jehoahaz as a young lion, who learned to catch the prey and devoured men, but at the same time it is said of him that he knew, that is, violated their widows (those of the slain) and laid waste their cities, that he, as Hävern. on the passage p. 303 has rightly determined the meaning of the words, "did not confine his violence merely to single acts of oppression, but extended it to the inheritance of the slain, the widows and all their circumstances, the cities where they dwelt.—V. 10 ff. בָּעֵת הַהִיא, that is, during the three months' reign of Jehoiachin, in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 10, the time is more exactly determined, לִתְשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה, that is, in the beginning of the year, in the spring (comp. above p. 285), whence we at the same time perceive, that Jehoiachin ascended the throne in the last months of the year. The *kethibh* עָלָה needs no alteration, as the verb often stands in the singular before the plural subject, see Ew. Gr. § 567.—The עַבְדֵי נְבֻכ׳

are different from the גְּדוּדִים (v. 2); Nebuchadnezzar now sent his generals with an army to Jerusalem, to besiege it, and shortly after the siege was begun followed himself to punish the revolt of Jehoiakim in his son and successor. V. 12. וַיֵּצֵא "Jehoiachin went out," that is, surrendered, *potestati ejus se commisit* (Seb. Schm.) Older expositors, as C. a Lap., Seb. Schm. think that Jechoiachin took this step *suadente Jeremia, ne Hierosolima everteretur.* Possible, but not probable, on account of Jer. xxii. 25—27, and by no means proved by Jer. xxxviii. 2. Thus much only is certain, that Jehoiachin, perceiving the impossibility of being able long to withstand the Chaldee besieging army, hoped by a voluntary surrender to gain the favour of the enemy and perhaps to retain the throne as vassal. But Nebuchadnezzar no longer exercised grace, as on the first taking of Jerusalem towards Jehoiakim, but took the king captive and carried him with his family to Babylon, as Jeremiah (xxii. 24 ff.) had already predicted to him under Jehoiakim.—That immediately after the king his mother Nehushta is mentioned in v. 12 among those going out to Nebuchadnezzar, and v. 13 among those carried to Babylon, occurs not because she had the guardianship of the king not yet come of age (Mich., Der., and others), but because she as הַגְּבִירָה (Jer. xxix. 2), that is, Sultana Validé, held a very influential position in the kingdom (comp. p. 219 f.) וַיִּקַּח אֹתוֹ "he took him (Jehoiachin) captive." The eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign is computed from the time when his father made over to him the supreme command of the army for the war with Nechoh, according to which his first year coincides with the fourth of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxv. 1.) Because Nebuchadnezzar henceforth appears before the Jews as king, though at first only acting in his father's name, the beginning of his reign is always computed from this point of time in our books and in Jeremiah, comp. besides our passage xxv. 8; Jer. xxxii. 1, and his reign, according to this computation, amounts to 44—45 years, comp. xxv. 27, and Hitzig on Jer. xxv. 1.—V. 13. After Nebuchadnezzar had taken Jehoiachin captive, and as we must assume entered the city, he plundered the treasures of the temple and the palace, and cut up the golden vessels made by Solomon, that is, separated the

golden plating from them: comp. on קָצַץ the remarks on xvi. 17. On the first taking of Jerusalem in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar had seized a portion of the golden vessels of the temple and placed them in the temple of his god at Babylon. These were obviously the smaller vessels of solid gold, basins, dishes, cups, knives, tongs, and the like, perhaps also the golden candlesticks; comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 7, Dan. i. 2, which Cyrus again delivered to the Jews when returning to the land of their fathers (Ezr. i. 7 ff.) Nebuchadnezzar, therefore, now took the gold from the larger articles, which were only plated with this metal, as the altar of incense, the table of shew bread, the ark of the covenant, and carried it away as spoil, so that in the last conquest of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, except some gold and silver basins and dishes (comp. xxv. 15), only the larger brazen or copper vessels of the court were left (xxv. 13—17; Jer. xxvii. 18 ff.)—The words, "as Jehovah had ordered," refer particularly to xx. 7 and Is. xxxix. 6, but at the same time also to the sentence of other prophets, as Jer. xv. 13 and xvii. 3.—V. 14—16. Besides these treasures he carried away the best part of the nation, not only the strongest in body and mind, but as may be perceived from Jer. xxiv., the best of the people even in a moral point of view, to Babylon. Those carried away are first in v. 14 stated as a total sum of 10,000, and then specified in vv. 15 and 16, the king, with his mother and his wives, his ministers (סָרִיסָיו), and the heads of the people, without stating the number; farther, the warriors 7000 men, finally, the forgers and locksmiths 1000 men, so that 10,000 are obtained, if we reckon the number of the courtiers and heads of the people at 2000. So is this verse rightly understood by most interpreters; for the words כָּל־הַשָּׂרִים and כֹּל־גִּבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִל (v. 14) correspond to אוּלֵי הָאָרֶץ (v. 15) and כָּל־אַנְשֵׁי הַחַיִל (v. 16) and the words הֶחָרָשׁ וְהַמַּסְגֵּר (v. 14) recur in v. 16. גבורי החיל and אנשי החיל are not rich and wealthy, but warriors, soldiers. The שָׂרִים princes, heads of tribes and families, are called as the representatives and heads of the people אוּלֵי הָאָרֶץ "the potentates of the land." Among these are perhaps also included the priests and prophets not specially named here, but according to Jer. xxix. 1 carried

away at the same time, Ezekiel for instance (Ezek. i. 1 f.), as the spiritual overseers of the people. For the unusual form אוּלֵי the Masoretes have substituted the more usual אֵילֵי (comp. Ex. xv. 15; Ezek. xvii. 13.) כָּל־יְרוּשָׁלַם that is, the whole body of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, is first more exactly defined by enumerating the various classes of inhabitants, and then limited by the addition, "nothing was left save דַּלַּת עַם־הָאָרֶץ the weak and insignificant populace," from which Nebuchadnezzar apprehended no new rebellion. כָּל גִּבּוֹרִים עֹשֵׂי מִלְחָמָה forms the contrast to דַּלַּת עַם הָאָרֶץ, as v. 16, all that were carried away to Babylon, not merely the heads of the people with the king, his family and courtiers, and the warriors, but even the forgers and locksmiths are included in it. עֹשֵׂי מִלְחָמָה therefore denotes here not engaged in war, but as de Wette has rightly rendered, fit for service. חָרָשׁ denotes the labourers and artizans in stone, metal and wood (comp. Ges. *thes. s.v.*), and therefore includes carpenters, smiths, and masons; and it is very possible, that Nebuchadnezzar removed all those operatives, who could lend effectual aid to a new rebellion. But especially would he look after the smiths, who could forge arms. For this reason, and on account of the combination of חָרָשׁ with מַסְגֵּר I have preferred the rendering forgers. So also de Wette renders here, but in Jer. xxiv. 1, and xxix. 2, carpenters. מַסְגֵּר denotes neither *janitores* (תַּרְעָא Chald.), nor *mercatores* (Cler.), still less *viros doctos, qui aliis obturant os et ea proponunt, quae ab aliis solvi nequeunt* (Kimchi), but the locksmith, *claustrarium, qui claustra et pessulos facit* (Gesen.)—V. 17. Over the feeble people left behind, Nebuchadnezzar appointed Mattaniah the youngest son of Josiah (comp. Jer. i. 3, xxxvii. 1, and our remarks on v. 8) and uncle of the captive, Jehoiachin, king under the name of Zedekiah. With regard to the change of name comp. on xxiii. 34. צִדְקִיָּהוּ the righteousness of Jehovah denotes him under whose reign the Lord will impart righteousness to his people. Mattaniah selected for himself this with distinct reference to the Jehovah tsidkenu announced by Jeremiah xxiii.; comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 560.

CHAPTER XXIV. 18—20 & XXV.

REIGN OF ZEDEKIAH, AND FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH, CH. XXIV. 18, XXV. 26. SUBSEQUENT FATE OF JEHOIACHIN, VV. 27—30.

To this section ch. lii. of Jeremiah affords a parallel agreeing for the most part to a word. In Jer. lii. is wanting only the account of the murder of Gedaliah, and the flight of the people left in the land to Egypt (2 Ki. xxv. 22—26), instead of which a survey of the Jews, carried by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, is given (vv. 28—30.) Concerning the mutual relation of the two narratives, three different opinions prevail. Some assume that Jer. lii. is a historical appendix to the predictions of this prophet taken by the compiler of them, as far as the passage, vv. 28—30, from our 2d Book of Kings (Grot., Rosenm., Maur. on Jer., Bertholdt Einl. iv. p. 1475 f., Herbst Einl. ii. 2, p. 55, and Welte in the same place). This hypothesis proves itself inadmissible and erroneous, first, because it does not know what to do with vv. 28—30, next, because, irrespective of all minor deviations, the text of Jeremiah, especially in vv. 19—23, is much fuller than vv. 15—17 in our book, and in the description of the brazen pillars of the temple contains several particulars, which are nowhere found in our Books of Kings, neither 2 Ki. xxv. 13—17, nor in the description of Solomon's temple, 1 Ki. vii. 15—22. Comp. also Jer. lii. 10 and 11 with 2 Ki. xxv. 7.—Others assume, that the section was originally appended by Jeremiah himself to his predictions, and admitted by him also into our Books of Kings, which were composed by him (Carpzov *introd.* iii. p. 152, ed. 2, and Hävern. Einl. ii. 1, p. 172 f.). To this assumption, which is advocated particularly by Hävern., it is chiefly objected that too great an age must be assigned to Jeremiah, if he wrote the last verses of this section, which record events of the time of Evilmerodach (561—559 B.C.), and Hävern. at present (see Einl. ii. 2, p. 248) finds this objection so weighty, that he is inclined to regard the verses 31—34, as an addition of the transcriber of this chapter. But this expedient is a mere evasion, and the assertion that vv. 28—30 (Jer.) decidedly form

the original proper close of the chapter, is neither proved by Häv. nor capable of proof. And, irrespective of these verses, the 52nd chapter of Jeremiah, in the state in which it has come down to us, cannot be a work of the prophet. For Jeremiah, if he wrote the history of the fall of the kingdom of Judah, could not possibly omit the removal of the principal part of the nation, the 10,000 men with Jehoiachin (2 Ki. xxiv. 14 ff.), and instead of this, mention three small partial removals, in which the sum of all that were removed amounted to 4600 souls.[1] Farther, we can see no reason why Jeremiah, after he had described the conquest of Jerusalem at large in chapter xxxix., should have here again described the same event much more briefly. Finally, if the prophet had composed the shorter description originally for our Books of Kings, he would not have prepared it again for the collection of his predictions, in order to give, instead of the history of Gedaliah, a quite incomplete survey of the various removals of the people to Babylon. As little could a collector of the predictions of Jeremiah borrow the 52nd chapter from our 2nd Book of Kings for the reasons already assigned. Thus there remains only the assumption that the two narratives are abstracts made by different persons from a common larger source, either from the annals of the kingdom, as Jahn (Einl. ii. 2, p. 565) thinks, or from another great work of a prophet, perhaps even from a more extended description of the last days of the kingdom of Judah, composed by Jeremiah or Baruch, analogous to the

[1] As of the three deportations mentioned Jer. lii. 28—30, the first is placed in the seventh, the second in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, neither can the one be identified with the removal of the most important part of the nation with Jehoiachin, which, according to 2 Ki. xxiv. 12, happened in the eighth year, nor the other, with the deportation after the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred, according to 2 Ki. xxv. 8, in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar. For the assumption of a different computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in Jer. lii. is a very poor resource, by which on the one hand the difficulties of the verses in question are not at all removed, and on the other, a contradiction is introduced into the chapter itself, as in v. 12, the usual computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign already mentioned in the explanation of v. 12 of our chapter, occurs. Moreover, it scarcely needs to be remarked, that even on the supposition of this wholly inadmissible assumption the chapter in question cannot have been written by Jeremiah.

two abstracts of the history of Hezekiah in 2 Ki. xviii., xx., and Is. xxxvi., xxxix. Comp. here also the general introduction.

Vv. 18—20. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 11—13, and Jer. lii. 1—3. Reign of Zedekiah; his revolt from the king of Babylon. If Zedekiah, the son of Josiah by Hamital (comp. v. 18 with xxiii. 31), and thus full brother of Jehoahaz and half-brother of Jehoiakim, ascended the throne at the age of twenty-one, 11½ years after Jehoahaz, he was 13½ years younger than the latter, who became king in his twenty-third year, and the youngest of the four sons of Josiah, whereas 1 Chron. iii. 15, Zedekiah is represented as the third, and Shallum, that is, Jehoahaz, as the fourth son of Josiah.—V. 19. Zedekiah's conduct as king is characterized as in every respect like that of Jehoiakim. This however does not imply, that he was guilty of all the particular sins of Jehoiakim; for, according to Jer. xxxviii. 5, 24 ff., he appears to have been of a weak character and entirely led by the nobles of his kingdom, without the courage to resist them, but the state of his heart towards God was the same as that of Jehoiakim; like the latter, he turned not to the word of the Lord, "he humbled not himself before Jeremiah the prophet, who spoke to him from the mouth of the Lord, he also rebelled against king Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God, and was stiffnecked and hardened his heart, so that he did not turn to the Lord the God of Israel" (2 Chr. xxxvi. 12 f.). Zedekiah with his servants and the whole people is similarly delineated in Jer. xxxvii. 2, and Ezekiel (xvii. 13 ff.) rebukes in sharp terms his covenant-breaking and thoughtless violation of oath, as a grievous transgression against the Lord.—V. 20. "For through the anger of Jehovah came this on Jerusalem and Judah, until he cast them out from his presence." The subject to הִיתָה is undetermined, and is to be derived from what precedes, namely, the evil-doing of Zedekiah, as S. Schm. has observed and so correctly determined the sense: *Non quod a Deo fuerit, ut Zedekias malus esset, sed ut Zedekias homo, si Brentio h. l. credimus, simplex, a consiliariis dependens, verbum tamen simul Dei contemnens et impœnitens* (2 Chr. xxxvi. 12 sq.) *fieret rex, futurus causa excidii Hierosolymitani.* With regard to the phrase, to cast from his sight, comp. on xvii. 23. "And Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." From the very first Zedekiah does not seem

to have had very sincere intentions of fidelity to the oath sworn to Nebuchadnezzar. For not long after his institution into the office of king he despatched an embassy to Babylon (Jer. xxix. 3), which, if we may judge from the contents of the letter to the exiles entrusted by Jeremiah to the ambassadors, could scarcely have any other object than to effect the return of those carried away by the king of Babylon. Afterwards, in the fourth year of his reign, he himself set out for Babylon (Jer. li. 59), obviously with the view of releasing himself if possible from the Chaldean dependence which was imposed upon him. And after his return in the fifth month of the same year (comp. Jer. xxvii. 3 with xxviii. 1) appear ambassadors of the Moabites, Ammonites, Tyrians, and Sidonians to conclude with him an alliance to shake off the Babylonian yoke. Farther Zedekiah turned to Egypt, and, finally, notwithstanding the warning predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, relying on the aid of the enterprising Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), Ezek. xvii. 15, revolted from the king of Babylon perhaps in the eighth or beginning of the ninth year of his reign.

Chap. xxv. Vv. 1—7. Comp. Jer. xxxix. 1, 7, 8, lii. 4—11. Siege and conquest of Jerusalem; flight, capture, blinding and carrying of Zedekiah to Babylon.—V. 1. As soon as Nebuchadnezzar received the news of Zedekiah's revolt, he certainly was not long in taking measures of revenge. In the ninth year of Zedekiah, on the tenth day of the tenth month, he arrived at Jerusalem with his army, and, by erecting towers round about the city, commenced the siege, which lasted to the fourth month of the eleventh year, and, therefore a year and a half. Comp. Ezek. xxiv. 1, where the day of the commencement of the siege was revealed to this prophet in the exile, and Jer. xxxix. 1 and 2, where the beginning and end of it are stated in accordance with our verse and Jer. lii. 4—6. During the siege the Egyptian king Hophra marched to the aid Zedekiah. On the intelligence of this Nebuchadnezzar broke up with his army from Jerusalem to march against him, and drove him back to his own country, without, it appears, having come to an engagement with him (Jer. xxxvii. 5 ff.; Ezek. xvii. 17.)—At the same time with Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar also besieged the fenced cities Lachish and Azekah, while all the other cites of

Judah were already taken (Jer. xxxiv. 7.) דָּיֵק a late word occurring only in Jer. and Ezek. from the root דוּק *speculari, prospicere*, denotes a watchtower, and stands here in a collective sense. The signification assigned to it by Mich. and defended by Hitzig on Jer. lii. 4, line of circumvallation, *περίτειχος* (LXX.) cannot be etymologically justified; see Ges. *thes.* i. 330, and Häv. on Ezek. p. 49 f.—That Jerusalem could stand a siege of eighteen months is to be ascribed less to the courage and strength of the Jewish army than to its own strong fortifications. For even if in the removal of the best of the nation under and with Jehoiachin many brave men had escaped the deportation by flight and rallied again under Zedekiah, yet the Jewish kingdom was so weakened by the captivity that it could never have resisted the Chaldean army, had it not found its greatest protection in the strong walls of Jerusalem, which was fortified even by its situation. Trusting thereto Zedekiah also gave no heed to the repeated admonitions of the prophet Jeremiah to save himself with his capital and his people from inevitable destruction by surrendering to Nebuchadnezzar (comp. Jer. xxi., xxxvii., and xxxviii.), but pushed matters to extremity, until the famine so prevailed that it gave occasion to inhuman scenes of atrocity (comp. Lam. ii. 20—22, iv. 9, 10) and the walls were broken through by the besiegers. The prevalence of the famine is mentioned not *quod propter eam non aptus fuit amplius populus ad resistendum* (S. Schm. and others), but in token of the truth of the prophetic announcements, Lev. xxvi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 53—57; Jer. xv. 2 f., xxvii. 13; Ezek. iv. 16 f., etc.—V. 4. In the beginning the date of the month is wanting; by an error of transcription the words בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי (Jer. lii. 6) have fallen out. וַתִּבָּקַע הָעִיר, that is, the walls were broken through by the enemy, so that they entered the city. From the detailed description of this irruption into the city, Jer. xxxix. 3—5, it appears that the Chaldeans burst through the walls of the lower city, the second wall built by Hezekiah and Manasseh (2 Chr. xxxii. 5, and xxxiii. 14) and occupied the lower city (הַמִּשְׁנֶה xxii. 14); for the Chaldean commanders after this irruption posted themselves at the middle gate, which at all events was in the wall separating the upper city, or Zion, from the lower city, and formed the

entrance from the latter to the former (comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 2, p. 222.) When Zedekiah saw them here he made his escape with his troops by night on the way through the gate between the two walls by the king's garden, and fled to the plain, but was pursued by the Chaldeans and overtaken in the plains of Jericho, while his whole army was scattered from him (vv. 4, 5), exactly as Ezekiel (xii. 12 ff.) had foreseen in the spirit. Probably the region about the gate through which Zedekiah fled, was less carefully watched by the Chaldeans, so that he got off, and was only overtaken and captured by the pursuing Chaldeans some miles from Jerusalem. The distance from Jerusalem to Araba is reckoned at five hours (Rob. ii. p. 536.) In our text the verb is wanting in the sentence וְכָל־אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וגו׳ and the various attempts of the old expositors to explain it by grammatical ellipses prove to be so forced that we must here also suppose something dropped out of the text. In Jer. lii. 7 and xxxix. 4 stand the words יִבְרְחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מֵהָעִיר of which the one verb at least must have originally stood here. דֶּרֶךְ שַׁעַר the way which led through the gate. The situation of "the gate between the two walls" is more exactly defined by אֲשֶׁר עַל־גַּן הַמֶּלֶךְ. The king's garden lay, according to Neh. iii. 15, at the pool of Siloam, that is, at the mouth of the Tyropœon; comp. Rob. ii. p. 142 ff. Consequently a double wall must here have barred the entrance into the glen between the southeast corner of Zion and the southern point of Ophel,[1]

[1] A trace of the outermost of these two walls appears to be still extant in the "rude pathway which crosses the mouth of the Tyropœon, on a mound hard by the old mulberry tree which marks the traditional spot of Isaiah's martyrdom" (Rob. ii. p. 147, and i. p. 384), but the inner wall perhaps went over from Zion to Ophel, directly below the pool of Siloam. Between these two walls there was in Hezekiah's time a reservoir, מִקְוֶה (Is. xxii. 11), for the water of the old pool, that is, the so-called pool of Siloam, the position of which in all probability is still to be found in the basin above the afore-mentioned mound, which is now cultivated as a garden, and where formerly, according to the accounts of the old travellers, was a large collection of water (Rob. ii. p. 147.) This O. Thenius has shown with a high degree of evidence in his learned treatise on the tombs of the kings of Judah, with a plan of Jerusalem, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.

through the gate of which Zedekiah escaped. To וַיֵּלֶךְ the subject הַמֶּלֶךְ is wanting, which appears from the connection. דֶּרֶךְ הָעֲרָבָה the way toward the plain. הָעֲרָבָה denotes in the Old Testament the great plain or valley which extended from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, and thence to the head of the Elanitic Gulf, and in the region of the Dead Sea near Jericho expanded to the great breadth of eleven or twelve miles (Rob. ii. p. 451, comp. p. 536), so that here the part of it situated west of the Jordan bore the name of Arboth of Jericho (Jos. iv. 13, v. 10 etc.), the eastern part that of Arboth of Moab (Num. xxii. 1; Deut. xxxiv. 1, 8.) At present the old name العربة remains only in the southern half of this depression from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf; the northern part, through which the Jordan flows, from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea is called الغور *el Ghor*; comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 1066, Hengstenb. d. Gesh. Bil. p. 227 ff., and Rob. Pal. iii. p. 153 ff. ii. p. 498 ff., 535 ff., etc.—V. 6. Zedekiah, seized by the Chaldeans, is brought to the king of Babylon at Riblah and there judged. According to v. 1 Nebuchadnezzar had personally opened the siege of Jerusalem; subsequently, however, perhaps after having repelled the Egyptians marching to the relief of the besieged city, he committed to his generals the prosecution of the long protracted siege, and retired himself to Riblah in the land of Hamath (comp. on xxiii. 33), from which he directed the whole operations of the war. דִּבֶּר מִשְׁפָּט אֶת־פְּלֹנִי is properly to engage in a lawsuit with any one, then, to hear and judge any one. The prophet Jeremiah always uses the plural מִשְׁפָּטִים in this phrase, comp. i. 16, iv. 12, xxxix. 5, and lii. 9.—Instead of the plural וַיְדַבְּרוּ stands in Jer. xxxix. 5, and lii. 9, the sing. וַיְדַבֵּר "he (the king of Babylon) gave judgment upon him;" so also in the following verse the sing. וַיִּשְׁחַט for שָׁחֲטוּ.—V. 7. The judgment passed and immediately executed upon Zedekiah was the righteous recompense for his breach of oath and disregard of the

1844, part i. p. 19 ff., which unfortunately only came under my eye when the greater part of this work was printed, so that I could not sooner refer to it.

decree of the Lord announced to him by Jeremiah during the siege, that he, by a voluntary surrender to the Chaldeans, would save not only his life but also Jerusalem from destruction, but by the contrary course would prepare the most ignominious ruin for himself, his own, the city, and the whole people; comp. Jer. xxxviii. 17 ff., xxxii. 5, xxxiv. 3 ff.—His sons, who, although not mentioned in the foregoing narrative, had yet fled with him and been seized, likewise, according to Jer. xxxix. 6, and lii. 10, all the nobles and princes of Judah were slain before his eyes; thereupon he himself was blinded, bound with two chains of brass, and carried to Babylon, where, according to Jer. lii. 11, he remained in prison till the day of his death, so that he came to Babylon, as Ezekiel xii. 13 had predicted, but did not see the land, and there died. Blinding seems to have been a usual punishment with the Babylonians as with the Persians (comp. Herod. vii. 18, and Brisson. *de regio Pers. princ.* p. 589), where it is still inflicted on the princes who are declared to have forfeited the right to the throne, comp. Chardin in Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 250 ff.—Samson also was blinded by the Philistines, Judg. xxi. 16.

Vv. 8—21. Comp. Jer. xxxix. 8—10, and lii. 12—27. Burning of the temple and the city, and razing of its walls, vv. 8—10; removal of the people except the lowest populace, vv. 11 and 12; destruction of the great brazen vessels of the temple, and removal of the broken metal, together with the remaining gold and silver vessels, vv. 13—17; execution of more captives at Riblah, vv. 18—21.—V. 8. Instead of "on the seventh day" stands in Jer. lii. 12 "on the tenth day of the month." This difference may at all events be explained with the old interpreters by the burning of the city lasting several days, so that the seventh or the tenth day might be named, according as the beginning or end was stated. All other attempts at reconciliation are unnatural. But as some other differences of this kind, as v. 17 three cubits for five cubits (Jer. lii. 22), and five men (v. 19) for seven men (Jer. lii. 25), occur, we can scarcely explain them otherwise than as having originated from the exchange of the letters of the old alphabet used as numerals, whereby, however, in the first and second case it must remain undecided, which text contains the error.—The nineteenth year

of Nebuchadnezzar is the eleventh of Zedekiah, comp. on xxiv. 8.—Nebuzaradan נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן, according to the explanation of Gesenius, *Mercurii dux dominus, i.e., cui Mercurius favet (thes.* ii. 839.) רַב־טַבָּחִים properly *praefectus carnificum*, the captain of the body-guard among the Babylonians and Egyptians (Gen. xxxvii. 36, 39, etc.), on whom, as on the Cherethites and Pelethites under the Israelitish kings, the execution of the sentence on criminals devolved, see above p. 30.—Nebuzaradan had not taken part in the conquest of Jerusalem (comp. Jer. xxxix. 3), but was ordered to Jerusalem after the punishment of Zedekiah to effect the destruction of the city, the removal of the remaining people, and the appointment of a governor over those who remained in the land. Instead of מֶלֶךְ stands in Jer. v. 12 עַמַּד לִפְנֵי מֶלֶךְ without אֲשֶׁר, which is not easily omitted in prose. The בְּ before יְרוּשָׁלַם in Jer. is here omitted as easily misunderstood. Hitzig connects it with בָּא, which is scarcely correct.—V. 9. The last words, "and every great house (properly every great man's house) burned he with fire," serve to define more strictly אֵת כָּל־בָּתֵּי; not all houses to the very last, but only great houses were burned down. In v. 10 כָּל is wanting before חוֹמֹת as not necessary for the sense, and אֵת before רַב טַבָּחִים (Jer. lii. 14), which can only be omitted by an error of the pen, as אֲשֶׁר רַב־טַבָּחִים without אֵת, with, affords no sense.—V. 11. הַנֹּפְלִים וגו', "the deserters who went over to the king of Babylon." Under the אֵת יֶתֶר הֶהָמוֹן the (still) remaining multitude are included the two before-mentioned classes of the people that were left. In Jer. lii. 15 stand הָאָמוֹן instead of הֶהָמוֹן, which Hitzig explains foreman of works according to Prov. viii. 30, and understands thereby the two classes הֶחָרָשׁ and הַמַּסְגֵּר (xxiv. 14—16). Very improbable. For even if the besieged city needed these operatives, and certainly had them, yet still they are not here specially mentioned, as we perceive from Jer. xxxiv. 9. אָמוֹן is perhaps only another form for הָמוֹן, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 116. The import of this verse is moreover limited by v. 12, according to which Nebuzaradan did not carry away the people to the last man, but left of the lowest of the people to be vine dressers and

husbandmen. דַּלַּת עַם הָאָרֶץ = דַּלַּת הָאָרֶץ comp. xxiv. 14. The form דַּלּוּת, Jer. lii. 16 is a plural with an abstract signification. For גֹּבִים from גּוּב *secuit, spec. aravit*, the *Keri* has יֹגְבִים for יָגֵב according to Jer. lii. 16 with the same meaning.—Vv. 13—17. Concerning the brazen pillars in the temple broken up by the Chaldeans, the brazen bases for the lavers and the brazen sea, compare on 1 Ki. vii. 15 ff. above p. 101 ff. The description is briefer in our text than in Jer. lii. 17—23. In v. 14 are omitted the greater and smaller brazen dishes מְזַרְקוֹת and כַּפּוֹת requisite for the service at the altar of burnt-offering, comp. Jer. lii. 18. In v. 15 of the gold and silver vessels, only מַחְתּוֹת firepans and מְזַרְקוֹת watering pots or dishes are mentioned, in Jer. lii. 19, besides these, five other names of similar vessels. In v. 16 supplementary reference is made to the unweighed abundance of the brass of those great vessels, and in v. 17 to the elaborate workmanship of the pillars. In Jer. the brazen oxen under the brazen sea are also mentioned in v. 20—23, and in the description of the brazen pillars several points are brought out, which in our narrative are wanting not merely here but also above in 1 Ki. vii. 15—22. See the particulars vol. i. p. 123—125.—On vv. 18—21 comp. Jer. lii. 24—27. The persons here mentioned, who were seized at the burning of the temple and the city, brought before Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah and there executed, are different from the princes and nobles of Judah, who were taken captive with Zedekiah in his flight, and slain before his eyes at Riblah (Jer. lii. 10 and xxxix. 6.) They are identified by Hitzig without the slightest ground. Seraiah, the high priest, was the grandfather or great-grandfather, not, as most of the ancients supposed, the father of Ezra the scribe (Ezr. vii. 1; 1 Chr. v. 40;) his son Jehozadak was carried away to Babylon (1 Chr. v. 41.) Zephaniah, a priest of the second order (כֹּהֵן מִשְׁנֶה, comp. on xxiii. 4), is probably the same as the son of Maaseiah, who, according to Jer. xxi. 2, xxix. 25 and 29, xxxvii. 3, held an important place among the priests. But whether the three keepers of the threshold, that is, doorkeeping Levites, seized along with these priests, "stood next to them in rank," as Hitzig conjectures, must be left undecided.—V. 19,

For אֲשֶׁר הוּא פָקִיד, "who was overseer," stands in Jer. lii. 25 אֲשֶׁר הָיָה פָקִיד, "who had been overseer." In favour of this reading Hitzig rejects the הוּא of our text, but wrongly; for this officer (סָרִיס) was not yet deprived of his office; he held it still, when he was seized by the Chaldeans.—"Five men of those who saw the face of the king" belonged to his immediate retinue, *de intimis consiliariis regis*. This designation is explained by the custom of eastern rulers to withdraw themselves as much as possible from the view of their subjects, comp. Paulsen, d. Reg. d. Morgenl. i. p. 482 ff. According to Jer. lii. 25 there were *seven*; comp. on v. 8. הַסֹּפֵר appears here to be equivalent to שַׂר הַצָּבָא. Against this, indeed, Hitzig has objected, "the general is no scribe," and therefore giving the preference to the reading of Jer. סֹפֵר without the article renders: "and the scribe of the commander;" but the correctness of this observation and rendering is liable to considerable doubt. For as the restrictive phrase הַמַּצְבִּא אֶת־עַם הָאָרֶץ can be referred only to סֹפֵר, not to שַׂר הַצָּבָא, which needs no such restriction, so סֹפֵר here at all events denotes a military officer (comp. above p. 43 note), in which case it is not easy to perceive, why this סֹפֵר who summons the people to war and drills them to arms, might not be a commander and be so designated. הִצְבִּא *procedere jussit in bellum* denotes probably not merely the levying of troops, but at the same time the drilling of those levied in the use of arms. The sixty men of the עַם הָאָרֶץ belonged either to the instigators of the rebellion or had by some other means incurred the resentment of the Chaldeans, so that they were executed and not carried into exile like the rest of the people.—V. 21. With the words וַיִּגֶל וגו׳, "so Judah was carried away out of the land," the narrative of the destruction of the kingdom of Judah is closed, comp. xvii. 23. The immediately following verses 22—26, give an account of the people who were left in the land.

Vv. 22—26. Over the people left in the land Nebuchadnezzar appointed Gedaliah as governor, who fixed his residence at Mizpah. After the Chaldeans had departed, the fugitives assembled around him, and among them the officers of war, who had escaped by flight from the hands of the Chaldeans, and re-

ceived from him the assurance on oath of protection and security from the Chaldeans, if they would only conduct themselves peaceably and cultivate the land. But Gedaliah was soon slain at the instigation of the princes of the Ammonites (Jer. xl. 14), by Ishmael, one of the officers, a scion of the royal blood, in consequence of which deed the others with the people fled into Egypt from fear of the vengeance of the Chaldeans. Concerning these events, related here only in a scanty abstract, we receive much more particular accounts from Jer. xi.—xliv., where the procedure of this prophet among the people still left in the land is described.—V. 22. Gedaliah was the son of Ahikam, who had formerly saved the life of Jeremiah (Jer. xxvi. 24), and the grandson of Shaphan, a man not otherwise known, comp. on xxii. 12. Lyra and some Rabbins take Gedaliah to be a deserter, *qui in suprema urbis obsidione dediderat se Chaldaeis, monita Jeremiae suadentis hortantisque regem et populum, ut dedentes se mala extrema evitarent, secutus*, (comp. Calmet on our verse). A not improbable conjecture, but still we cannot receive it as a historical fact. Gedaliah had received from Nebuchadnezzar the superintendence of all that were left in the land, men, women, children, poor, also some daughters of the king, and courtiers, whom it had not been thought necessary or worth while to remove, comp. Jer. xl. 7, xli. 10 and 16. Nebuzaradan had also assigned to him the prophet Jeremiah, who was undetermined to make use of the freedom given him to go to Babylon or remain in the land, Jer. xl. 2—6, comp. with xxxix. 14.—V. 23. Concerning Mizpah in the land of Benjamin, see above p. 235.—Of the fugitives scattered in and beyond the land, (comp. Jer. xl. 7 and 11), who came to Gedaliah, the military officers are particularly mentioned. הָאֲנָשִׁים are the men belonging to the שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים; this appears even from our verse, inasmuch as הַמָּה וְאַנְשֵׁיהֶם is repeated at the close of the verse by הֵמָּה וְהָאֲנָשִׁים, and still more clearly from Jer. xl. 7 and 8, where the שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים by the addition אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה, who lived in the field, that is, in the open air, are designated as those who dwelt in the country. Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, is farther designated, v. 25, as the grandson of Elishama, probably the officer mentioned Jer. xxxvi. 12 and 20, and was of the seed royal. Of

the remaining persons nothing else is known; only of Johanan it is mentioned Jer. xl.—xlii., that he warned Gedaliah of the traitor Ishmael, and, when the former, disregarding his warning, was slain, put himself at the head of the people, and, notwithstanding the dissuasions of Jeremiah, fled with them to Egypt. In Jer. xl. 8, along with Johanan, his brother Jonathan is mentioned, which name has probably fallen out here by a slip of the pen. Before הַנְּטֹפָתִי stands in Jer. xl. 8, וּבְנֵי עֵיפַי, according to which not Seraiah, but עֵיפַי came from Netophah, whose sons were among the officers of war. Netophah, according to Ezr. ii. 22, Neh. vii. 26, was in the neighourhood of Bethlehem, and is therefore scarcely the same as the present village Beit Netif, south-west of Jerusalem, comp. Rob. ii. p. 600. The name יַאֲזַנְיָהוּ is written Jer. xl. 8, יֶזַנְיָהוּ, and xlii. 1, יְזַנְיָה. Jaazaniah was a Syrian naturalized in the kingdom of Judah from the Syrian district and former kingdom of Maachah (מַעֲכָה), on the northern boundary of Palestine, on the western slope of Hermon, Deut. iii. 10, Jos. xii. 4 f., and von Raum. Pal. p. 224. בֶּן־הַמַּעֲכָתִי means the Maachathite. V. 24. Because they had borne arms against the Chaldeans, these fugitives feared their vengeance, as we may conclude from this, that Gedaliah promised them security on oath, and admonished them to remain in the land and be subject to the king of Babylon, and it would be well with them. According to Jer. xl. 9, he promises to intercede for them with the Chaldeans, and invites them to return to their cities and gather wine, fruits, and oil. The עַבְדֵי הַכַּשְׂדִּים are the officers, whom Nebuchadnezzar had left in the land and placed over it. The governor Gedaliah also had Chaldeans with him (v. 25.)—V. 25. Ishmael was sent by Baalis, the king of the Ammonites, and Gedaliah was apprized and warned by Johanan of the intended crime, but had given no credit to the information of Johanan (Jer. xl. 13—16). Ishmael perpetrated the murder, when he, with his ten men invited by Gedaliah to an entertainment, did eat in his house (Jer. xli. 3). The Jews and the Chaldeans with Gedaliah were military men (Jer. xli. 3), whom he as governor had with him for order and protection. Their number cannot have been great, as Ishmael with ten men was able to put them to death. After Ishmael had committed

this crime, and also slain a number of men from Shechem, Shiloh and Samaria, who came with an offering, he carried away captive the people that were in Mizpah, and departed to go over to the Ammonites, but, as soon as his deed was known, was pursued by Johanan and the other captains of the forces, and overtaken at Gibeon, whereupon the people that were carried away by him left him and passed over to Johanan, so that he only with eight men could escape and make his way to the Ammonites (Jer. xli. 4—13). But Johanan, with the other captains and the remaining people, went into the region of Bethlehem, with the view of fleeing into Egypt from fear of the Chaldeans. Here they applied, indeed, to the prophet Jeremiah, in order to learn from him the will of the Lord, but notwithstanding the word of the Lord communicated to them by him, that if they remained in the land they need not be afraid of the king of Babylon, but if they went to Egypt they should all perish by the sword, famine, and pestilence, and notwithstanding the prediction, that the Lord would also give Pharaoh Hophra into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xlii.), they proceeded to Egypt, taking the prophet with them, and settled in the various cities of Egypt, where they gave themselves up to idolatry, and could not be weaned from it even by the severest judgments denounced against them for it by Jeremiah in the name of the Lord (Jer. xliii. and xliv.)

Vv. 27—30. Comp. Jer. lii. 31—34. Jehoiachin is released from prison by Evilmerodach, brought to his court, and treated with honour. The thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin corresponds to the year 562–61 B.C., in which Nebuchadnezzar died, after a reign of forty-three years reckoned from 604. The twelfth month of this year coincides nearly with March 561. In this year his son Evilmerodach became king (בְּשָׁנַת מָלְכוֹ), and probably as soon as he ascended the throne showed favour to king Jehoiachin, after he had languished in prison for more than thirty-six years. Instead of the 27th day the 25th is given in Jer. lii. 31; a difference, again, which has arisen by the exchange of similar letters; comp. on v. 8. Evilmerodach (אֱוִיל מְרֹדַךְ, *Εὐειλμαράδουχος* in Berosus) reigned according to Berosus, in Josephus *c. Ap.* i. 20 and the canon of Ptol., two

years, according to the testimony of Josephus *ἀνόμως καὶ ἀσελγῶς*, and was murdered by his brother-in-law Neriglissar. According to Josephus (*Ant.* x. 11, 2) he reigned eighteen, and according to Alex. Polyh. (*in Eusebii Chron. arm.* p. 21), twelve years. But both statements are obviously false, and the two years' reign, for which also Niebuhr (kl. histor. Schrift. i. p. 199) has declared himself, is demanded by the chronology of the subsequent Babylonian sovereigns. Comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 41, and Win. R.W. i. p. 419, where also the other very diverse modes of writing the name are collected. נָשָׂא רֹאשׁ פל׳, to lift up the head of any one from prison, that is, to bring him out of it, comp. Gen. lx. 13.—V. 28. וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ טֹבוֹת, "he spake with him kindly," comp. Jer. xii. 6. "And set his seat above the seat of the kings that were with him in Babylon." This phrase is not with Hitzig to be taken literally, as if he gave him a higher seat, but figuratively, *loco honestiore eum habuit* (Rosenm.); he gave him precedence of the other kings. These kings were also probably those, who having, like Jehoiachin, been deprived of their lands by Nebuchadnezzar, lived at the Babylonian court for the augmentation of its splendour (Hitzig). Thus, for example, Cyrus kept the conquered Crœsus with him (Herod. i. 88.)—V. 29. "And he (Jehoiachin) changed his prison garments," that is, laid them aside and put on others. Joseph did the same, when he was brought from prison to appear before Pharoah (Gen. xli. 42). The subject to שָׁנָא is obviously Jehoiachin as in the following sentence, no longer Evilmerodach, as Dereser, Hitzig, and others suppose.—"He ate continually before him," that is, he lived at the royal table, comp. p. 25.—V. 30. Moreover, Jehoiachin received, as probably also the other kings, a daily allowance of food or provisions for the sustenance of the servants, who composed his small court. אֲרֻחָה (from ארח *definivit*) *cibi commeatusque portio alicui definita* (Gesen.). The words כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּיו many interpreters, for instance, Calmet, understand of the life of Evilmerodach; but Seb. Schm., with the older Rabbins, rightly declare in favour of its reference to the days of Jehoiachin *ex scopo hujus loci, qui est ut doceatur, quid deinceps Jojachino contigerit: quae narratio imperfecta esset, nisi tota ejus vita comprehenderetur.* Moreover, it cannot be inferred with certainty

from this statement, that Jehoiachin died before Evilmerodach (Havern. Einl. ii. 1. p. 170); for the favour shown to Jehoiachin by Evilmerodach might also be continued by his successors. Concerning the cause of this special kindness of Evilmerodach to Jehoiachin, Hitzig on Jer. has proposed various conjectures, all of which, however, have only slight probability. The higher ground of this favourable change in the captivity of Jehoiachin lies in the Divine purpose of grace, that the seed of David should be severely corrected indeed for their apostasy from the Lord, but not utterly cast off (2 Sam. vii. 14 and 15). It was at the same time for the whole captive people a prognostic of the future turning of their captivity, when they, recognising their exile as a merited punishment for their sins, should turn to the Lord their God with all their heart.

THE

BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES:

BY

ERNST BERTHEAU,

PROFESSOR IN GOETTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

JAMES MARTIN, B.A.

EDINBURGH.

PREFACE.

It was originally the intention of the publishers to issue *Keil's* work on the Chronicles in connection with his Commentary on the Books of Kings. But on further consideration they have thought it unadvisable to do so. The character of that work, as stated in the title *(apologetischer Versuch)*, is purely apologetical. It was written as an answer to objections made by *De Wette* and *Dahler* to the credibility of the two Books of the Chronicles, objections which scarcely any one would think of repeating now. It is undoubtedly a book of great worth, not only meeting the attacks referred to in a thorough and successful manner, but containing a large amount of important matter which needs only to be thrown into a different shape to form the groundwork of a valuable exposition of these historical books. At the same time the prominence given to the (now exploded) objections offered by the writers named, and the space occupied by the answers to those objections, so greatly detract from the present worth of the book, especially to English readers, that the publishers have thought it right to give up the original design.

In the place of the work of *Keil* they have selected for publication the latest commentary that has appeared in Germany on the Books of Chronicles. As their object, however, has been rather to give completeness to the Commentary on Kings than to issue an independent exposition of the Chronicles, they have decided to omit certain portions of Bertheau's work, especially his notes on such passages as are found in precisely the same form in the Books of Kings. In other words this supplement contains an exposition of all the matter contained in the Chronicles, which has not already been expounded by *Keil* in this and the preceding volume, with the exception of the lengthy genealogical

tables, which occupy the first nine chapters of the first Book. The reader will also find between brackets occasional extracts from *Keil's* work on the Chronicles, which it has been thought desirable to introduce on account of their containing a fuller or more satisfactory elucidation of the text, than is to be found in the original work.

THE

BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES.

PART I.

GENEALOGICAL TABLES.

I. Chaps. i.—iii. *The Pedigree of David.* (1.) Chap. i. 1—23. The ten members from Adam to Noah; Noah's three sons, and the seventy nations that were descended from them. (2.) Vv. 24—42. The ten members from Shem to Abraham; his sons, and the seventy tribes that sprang either directly from Abraham or from the rest of the members named. Vv. 43—54. List of the kings and princes in Edom. (3.) Chap. ii. The twelve tribes of Israel, and the seventy descendants of Judah (vv. 1—41); an appendix to this list (vv. 42—55.) (4.) Chap. iii. The descendants of David.

II. Chap. iv.—vii.—*The twelve tribes of Israel.* (1.) Chap. iv. 1—23. The tribe of Judah. (2.) Vv. 24—43. The tribe of Simeon. (3.) Chap. v. 1—10. The tribe of Reuben. (4.) Vv. 11—22. The tribe of Gad. (5.) Vv. 23—26. The half of Manasseh. (6.) V. 27—vi. 66. The tribe of Levi. (7.) Chap. vii. 1—5. The tribe of Issachar. (8.) Vv. 6—11. The tribe of Benjamin. (9.) V. 12. The tribe of Dan. (10.) V. 13. The tribe of Naphtali. (11.) Vv. 14—19. The half tribe of Manasseh. (12.) Vv. 20—29. The tribe of Ephraim. (13.) Vv. 30—40. The tribe of Asher.

III. Chap. viii.—ix. 34. *The inhabitants of Jerusalem.* (1.) Chap. viii. The tribe of Benjamin. (2.) Chap. ix. 1—34. *The heads of the people* dwelling in Jerusalem.

PART II.

1 CHR. IX. 35 TO 2 CHR. XXXVI.

HISTORY OF THE KINGS IN JERUSALEM FROM DAVID TO ZEDEKIAH THE LAST IN THE SERIES OF KINGS BELONGING TO THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

I. CHAP. IX. 35—CHAP. XXIX.

HISTORY OF DAVID.

A few brief notices of the family of Saul, and the fate of his house, serve as an introduction to the history of David's reign in Jerusalem (chap. ix. 35—x. 14). The anointing of David in Hebron by the elders of the people is then dismissed in a very few words (chap. xi. 1—3). And without touching upon the relation in which he stood to Abner and to Saul's son Ishbosheth, or saying anything with reference to the period during which he reigned in Hebron, the historian hastens to describe the conquest of Jerusalem, which forms the starting-point for an elaborate account of the history of the kingdom in that city (chap. xi. 4—9). Having given a list of David's heroes (chap. xi. 10—47), he appends another list of those who attached themselves to him during the life time of Saul (chap. xii. 1—22), and then returns to chap. xi. 1—3, for the purpose of giving a more detailed description of the popular assembly which was held in Hebron, when David was chosen king (chap. xii. 23—40.) His principal object is to speak of the sacred institutions of which David was the founder, and to commemorate his care for the sanctuary of Israel; he therefore begins at once by relating how David brought up the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem (chap. xiii.). For a short time, however, he interrupts his narrative, and introduces a series of brief notices of the building of David's house, his

family, and a war with the Philistines (chap. xiv.). The thread is then resumed in chap. xv. and xvi. In the same manner does he break off his account of the intended erection of a temple (chap. xvii.), and after describing certain of David's wars and other events, resumes the subject at chap. xxi. 28, and brings it to a conclusion in chap. xxii. The historian is now able to proceed more quietly, and dwells at greater length upon the arrangements which were made by David for the worship of God (chap. xxiii.—xxvi.). A description of his army and a list of his officers are now introduced (chap. xxvii.), and these are followed by his final instructions and an account of his death (chap. xxviii. and xxix.).

1. Chap. ix. 35—Chap. x.

FAMILY OF SAUL AND FATE OF HIS HOUSE.

Chap. ix. vv. 35—44. *Saul's family.* This list has already been given in the account of the different families of the Benjaminites at chap. viii. 29—39, the only difference being that in the present instance it terminates with the sons of Azel, and therefore contains two verses less than the former list. *Herzfeld* quotes a statement of the *Mar Sutra* to the effect that 400 camel-loads, or, according to another passage, 1300 camel-loads of explanations had been written on this repetition and the ninth chapter in general. The reason for the repetition is simply this, that here the list forms an introduction to the account of Saul's death, whereas it is given in chap. viii. in order that the celebrated family of Saul may not be omitted from the list of the Benjaminites. Hence the list given in the verses before us serves to connect the history of the kingdom with the genealogical lists, which precede it. This might no doubt have been done by a simple reference to the list already given, or by repeating the first part alone. The historian apparently felt this, and therefore stopped at the first favourable opportunity, viz., when he reached the words, "these are the sons of Azel." He could not well stop before, as the list of the descendants of Ner is continued to this point in uninterrupted succession. The fondness of the his-

torian for genealogical lists may undoubtedly also be seen in this repetition; for, were it not for this predilection, he would probably have adopted some other means of connecting the narrative with the preceding genealogies.

Chap. x. 1—14. *Death of Saul. David obtains possession of the government.* The first twelve verses occur, with very slight variations, in precisely the same form in 1 Sam. xxxi. 1—13. The concluding remark in vv. 13, 14, is added by our historian, and shows that the account of Saul's death is intended as an introduction to the history of David. Vv. 1—12. These verses merely contain the concluding part of an account of the last battle between the Philistines and the Israelites under Saul, which is to be found at much greater length in the books of Samuel. According to 1 Sam. xxviii. 4 the Philistines, accompanied by David and his men, were encamped at Shunem, Saul and the Israelites on the mountains of Gilboa. They left their positions, however, and fought a pitched battle in the plain of Jezreel (chap. xxix. 1.) David took no part in the battle. The Israelites were defeated, and fled back to their former quarters, but were pursued by the Philistines. This accounts for the fact that (V. 1) *wounded* Israelites *fell in the mountains of Gilboa.*—V. 2. The Philistines *followed hard after* Saul. The verb literally denotes continuous and hot pursuit.—V. 3. Instead of *the shooters with bows*, we read in 1 Sam. xxxi. the shooters, men with bows. The word men probably appeared superfluous on account of the shooters being described as *archers* (shooters with bows), and was therefore omitted. Hence the reading in Samuel is to be regarded as the original text.—*Then the archers* of the Philistines *hit* Saul, *then he trembled before the archers.* When the archers, who evidently fought as light troops in the front ranks, came near to Saul, he trembled, as he had already done when he saw the camp of the Philistines (1 Sam. xxviii. 5), from a presentimen of his approaching defeat. The thought of imprisonment and of the insults to which he would be exposed overcame the hero. There is nothing in the words, which he addressed to his armour-bearer (v. 4), to lead us to conclude that in his last moments he was free from the agitation which his trembling had indicated. Hence the state of mind, in which we find Saul a short time before his death, does not furnish the least ground, as some have

supposed that it does, for questioning the correctness of the Masoretic explanation of the word וַיָּחֶל. This reading is confirmed by the preposition מן and the adverb "exceedingly," which is added in 1 Sam. xxxi. It is true the word only occurs here and in the corresponding passage in Samuel, but in Ps. xcvii. 4 we find ותחל, and the other persons of the Imperfect יחיל are by no means rarely met with. The translators of the Septuagint appear to have hesitated to adopt the rendering "he trembled." In the passage before us they have substituted *καὶ ἐπόνεσαν* (*Alex.* *ἐπόνεσεν*) *ἀπὸ τῶν τόξων;* but in 1 Sam. xxxi. they render the words in a very different manner, viz., *ἐτραυματίσθη εἰς τὰ ὑποχόνδρια.* From this *Thenius* conjectures that the reading in the original text must have been וַיֵּחַל אֶל הַמְּרֹרִים, *he was wounded near the gall.* But the present reading in the Chronicles favours such a conjecture even less than the text of the Book of Samuel.—V. 4. After "*these uncircumcised*" we find the words "thrust me through," in the Book of Samuel. It is very possible that they may have fallen out of our text in consequence of the same words occurring immediately before; at the same time it is equally possible that their introduction into the text of Samuel may be explained in the same way. As the request to the armour-bearer, "*draw thy sword and thrust me through,*" can only have proceeded from a desire that the Philistines might not *abuse* the living Saul, and as they would have quite as much power to abuse his corpse, after he had been slain by his armour-bearer, the reason assigned for the request, "thrust me through," can hardly have been "in order that they may not thrust me through." Saul was not afraid of being slain by the Philistines, as Abimelech had formerly feared to meet death at the hands of a woman (Judg. ix. 54), but what he feared was that he might fall into the hands of the Philistines alive. Hence we conclude that the words did not originally form part of the text. The supposition, that in the Book of Samuel they have crept in through an oversight, is confirmed by the fact, that the word is written the second time in precisely the same form as the first, although in the first instance it occurs as an Imperative.—V. 5. The armour-bearer kills himself, because he wishes not to outlive his king and captain, or to fall into the hands of the Philistines alive. We need not search for any other motive.—V. 6. And all his

house died together; in 1 Sam. xxxi. we read *and his armour bearer and all his men died that same day together.* And instead of the following passage (v. 7), *when the men of Israel saw that they fled,* we find in Samuel, "when the men of Israel . . . saw that the men of Israel fled." From this we conclude that the author of the Chronicles intentionally avoided speaking of the men of Saul or of Israel, who had taken part in the fight, because it was not his purpose to give a full description of the course of the battle. His design was merely to relate the death of Saul and his sons, that he might show how David obtained possession of the throne. As he wished to show the consequences of the battle with reference to the house of Saul in as few words as possible, he could very properly make use of the expression *and all his house died together,* although it was not strictly correct; for there was no necessity to mention Ishbosheth the son of Saul, who still remained alive, as the plan of his work did not require him to refer to the connection which existed between David and Ishbosheth, nor had he any occasion to say more about the perpetuation of the family of Saul in the descendants named in chap. ix. 35—44. All that his plan required was, that he should show how the government passed from Saul to David. The immediate cause of this was the death of Saul and of such of his sons as the nation might possibly have thought of, when they met to choose a new king.—V. 7. The bodies of Saul and his sons fell into the hands of the Philistines, for the Israelites, who dwelt in the neighbourhood of Gilboa, had deserted their cities on the flight of Saul and his sons, and were, therefore, not in a position to rescue their bodies from the enemy. The Israelites in the neighbourhood of Gilboa are here described as the men of Israel that were in the plain, *i.e.,* the plain of Jezreel. In Samuel they are called with greater precision "the men of Israel who were *by the side of the plain* and *by the side of* the Jordan," *i.e.,* those who dwelt to the west and east of Gilboa. The difference is very trifling, and there is no necessity for supposing that our historian had a faulty text before him (*Thenius* on Samuel), since there are other passages in which similar slight alterations occur.—V. 8. The following day the Philistines, on examining the dead, found the bodies of Saul and his sons. The rest of the day, on which the battle was fought, had probably been

occupied in the capture of the deserted cities. When the exertions of the conflict were over the next thing wanted was rest, and there was no necessity to search the bodies till the second day.—V. 9. *They stripped him and took his head and his armour.* (1 Sam. they cut off his head, and stripped off his armour). And *they sent away, sc.*, the head and the armour of Saul. According to a very common custom, the objects just named are not repeated. In the Septuagint translation of 1 Sam. we find καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτά, but it does not follow that the text must have had the third person plural suffix attached to the verb. In the passage before us they have merely καὶ ἀπέστειλαν. The head and armour of Saul were sent throughout the land of the Philistines, as a welcome confirmation of the good news of victory (cf. Judges xix. 29 seq.), to announce the glad tidings to *the idols* and to the people. In 1 Sam we read *in the house of their idols*, but the word *house* has been omitted by the Septuagint. The reading in the Chronicles is the more correct of the two.—V. 10. The armour of Saul was subsequently deposited *in a temple of the Philistines*; cf. 1 Sam. xxi. 9, according to which David had given the sword of Goliath to the high priest to be preserved in the tabernacle. The temple is described in Samuel as the temple of Astarte, and this harmonises very well with the words which follow in the passage before us: *they fixed his skull in the temple of Dagon.* These words are not found in Samuel, and it might be thought that the clause, "they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan," had been substituted for them. But notwithstanding the similarity between the two clauses, we do not agree with *Thenius* that the one is a faulty copy of the other. It is more reasonable to suppose that they stood side by side in the original text, since the text of the book of Samuel furnishes no information as to what the Philistines did with the head; and though the account in the Chronicles appears complete without the clause respecting the fastening of the body of Saul to the wall of Bethshan, yet it would serve to throw light upon the rest of the narrative if it had been there. The occurrence of the word תִּקְעוּ in both clauses, and the fact that in each case it ends with ו, may account for the omission of one of the two. But such an oversight would only account for the absence of the words "*they fastened*

his head in the temple of Dagon" from the book of Samuel. It would be trifling and arbitrary to suppose that the other clause was omitted from our passage through a similar oversight; in fact such a supposition would be altogether inadmissible, for in 1 Sam. xxxi. 12 further reference is made to the statement in v. 10, that *they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan*, but there is no such reference in the Chronicles. From this we conclude that the historian abridged the narrative, and intentionally omitted to state that the corpse was fixed to the wall of Bethshan and fetched away by the men of Jabesh-Gilead; just as in other respects he has made a freer use of his original sources in vv. 10—12.—V. 12. Most of the deviations from 1 Sam. xxxi. are to be traced to the fact that our historian saw no special reason for relating that the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead took the body of Saul from the wall at Bethshan. He omits the fact that they *went all night*, because he was not concerned with the distance they had to travel. גִּבְעַת, for גִּבְעָה in 1 Sam. xxxi., appears to be a word belonging to a later period of the language; at least it is by no means rare in Aramæan, whilst this is the only place in the Old Testament in which it occurs. There is something striking in the omission of the clause, they *burnt them there*. As the burning of a corpse was not a customary thing, and is expressly mentioned in Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9 as an ignominious punishment for great crimes, it certainly presents some difficulty, especially as it is not easy to bring the burning of the bodies into harmony with the statement that they were buried under a tree at Jabesh, and that David afterwards fetched away the bones of Saul and Jonathan from that spot, and buried them in the family sepulchre of Kish (2 Sam. xxi. 12 sqq.) There can be little doubt that our historian intentionally omitted the words relating to the burning. In fact his design in describing the whole transaction did not require him to mention it, and there was therefore no inducement to enter upon an explanation of this particular circumstance for the purpose of guarding against the offence, which they might otherwise have caused. If it could be shown that the burning referred to in 1 Sam. xxxi. 12 is to be understood in the same sense as that described in 2 Chr. xvi. 14, "they made a very great burning for him;" xxi. 19, "his people made no burning for him, like the burning of his fathers;" and

Jer. xxxiv. 5, "with the burnings of thy fathers . . so shall they burn for thee," there would be nothing to astonish us in the absence of any notice of the occurrence here. For in that case the passage merely contains a more precise description of the *honour* shown to Saul at his burial. It must, however, be borne in mind that in the three passages just referred to, the verb is construed with the dative of the person, whereas in 1 Sam. it is followed by an accusative. The inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead, a city on the left bank of the Jordan opposite to Bethshan, showed, in their anxiety that Saul and his sons should have an honourable burial, their attachment to the house of Saul, to whom they were indebted for deliverance from great dangers (1 Sam. xi.)

Vv. 13, 14. The *transgression which he committed against the Lord* was according to these verses a double one: (1) he transgressed *against the word of Jehovah which he did not regard* (this refers especially to the command of Jehovah to lay Amalek under the ban (1 Sam. xv. 11 compared with chap. xxviii. 18; compare also 1 Sam. xiii. 13 with chap. x. 8); (2) he transgressed in *asking counsel* inasmuch as he made use of *necromancy, that he might obtain an oracular response*, cf. 1 Sam. xxviii. The Septuagint has most unnecessarily interpolated the clause *καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ Σαμουὴλ ὁ προφήτης*, vid. Wisdom xlvi. 20.—V. 14. The meaning is: because he did not consult Jehovah, He left him to die. Saul did consult Jehovah, but received no answer (1 Sam. xiv. 37 compared with xxviii. 6), because Jehovah had departed from him (1 Sam. xxviii. 15); and instead of seeking with all earnestness to obtain the favour of Jehovah and then consulting him again, he applied to the necromancer in Endor. And *turned the kingdom*; vid. chap. xii. 23.

2. CHAP. XI. 1—9.

DAVID IS ANOINTED KING IN HEBRON, AND CONQUERS JERUSALEM.

Vv. 1—3. (Compare 2 Sam v. 1—3.) After the death of Saul the country on the east of the Jordan, and in a short time

that on the west also, with the exception of the province of Judah, over which David ruled in Hebron, was brought by the skilful generalship of Abner to acknowledge Ishbosheth as king, 2 Sam. ii. 8 seq. It was not till Abner and Ishbosheth were dead, and when there was no one left belonging to the house of Saul but the lame Meribosheth, who was then but twelve years old, that all the Israelites resolved to make David king. These verses contain an account of the assembly in which this resolution was carried into effect.—V. 1. *Then all the Israelites assembled together*, or as it reads in 2 Sam. v., then all the tribes of Israel came *to David unto Hebron*, in order that in a regular assembly of the fighting men of the community, of which we have a full description in chap. xii. 23—40, such a resolution might be adopted as would be binding upon the whole people. *Behold we are thy bone and thy flesh* (Gen. xxix. 14), thou art our countryman, thou belongest like us to the community of Israel, and thou art known to the whole community as their successful general in the wars they have waged with foreign foes, for (v. 2) *a long time ago, even when Saul was king, thou didst lead Israel to war and conduct them back again* (cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 13, 16); *and then Jehovah thy God said to thee*, by Samuel the prophet, &c. (vv. 3, 10; 2 Sam. iii. 9, 18; cf. 1 Sam. xvi. 1—3.) The points of difference between the verse before us and 2 Sam. v. 2 are very trifling.—V. 3. *The elders of Israel* were the representatives of the whole community, who *made a covenant* with David in a solemn manner *(before Jehovah)*; *i.e.*, they made provision for the maintenance of the rights and obligations of the king on the one hand, and those of the people on the other (cf. 1 Sam. x. 25.) Whether the words, "*according to the word of Jehovah by Samuel*," which do not occur in 2 Sam. v. 3, are to be regarded as an explanatory clause appended by the author of the Chronicles, or whether they have fallen out of the text of Samuel through an oversight caused by the similarity in the terminations of the two words Israel and Samuel, as *Thenius* supposes, may not be easy to determine. But on comparing v. 10 in the chapter before us *(according to the word of Jehovah)* with 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, we are led to think the former opinion the more probable of the two. The two verses relating to the length of time, which was spent by David in Hebron and

Jerusalem, are omitted here. The historian hastens to describe the conquest of Jerusalem, and therefore passes quickly over the sojourn in Hebron. And as he introduces the chronological data in a fitting place (chap. xxix. 27), we should be led to conclude that he purposely omitted them here, were it not that it is more probable that the two verses in question were added by the author of the book of Samuel, than that they formed part of the original sources, which he employed.

Vv. 4—9. (cf. 2 Sam. v. 6—10.)—V. 4. Instead of "*David and all Israel*," we find in Samuel, "*the king and his men*;" and instead of "*to Jerusalem, which is Jebus and there are the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land*," we have merely, "*to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land*," the latter reading being probably an abbreviation of the former.—V. 5. The plural "*and the inhabitants of Jebus said*," follows naturally from the words of the previous verse; but in Samuel we find the singular "*and he said*." Although the Jebusites called out to him in a contemptuous tone, "*thou shall not come in, he took the castle of Zion*," which then received the name of *city of David* (v. 7, and chap. xiii. 13.) We have only the conclusion of the contemptuous speech of the Jebusites given here, whereas in Samuel it is reported more fully, not because the historian omitted the commencement by accident, as *Thenius* thinks, but more probably because he had another account before him, in which there was no reference to *the lame and the blind*, cf. v. 6.—V. 6. *And David said*; in Samuel we have also the words, "*in that day*," before Jebus was taken, "*David said*;" but the rest of the passage is very different. *Thenius* supposes that the difference arose from the fact that the author of the Chronicles filled up an illegible passage by the words of the text. But there is no necessity for such a conjecture. The very peculiar account in Samuel, which evidently rests upon a strictly historical basis, is clearly the earlier and more precise of the two. It may, however, be easily conceived that in other documents the name of Joab occurred in connection with the conquest of Jebus, like that of Othniel in connection with the conquest of Kirjath-Sepher (Judg. i. 12 sqq.), and that a celebrated saying of David on the occasion of its capture was there associated with Joab, on account of the deeds recorded in vi 8. Thus the same saying

was reported in two different ways; the more simple of the two, and that which presents the least difficulties, being given in the Chronicles. Joab was not appointed *chief and captain* in consequence of his bravery on the occasion of the siege of Jerusalem, he had previously been at the head of David's warriors (2 Sam. ii. 13.)—(On the difficulty presented by these parallel passages, *Keil* says, "the former clause, relating to the lame and the blind, may have been omitted by the author of the Chronicles as not bearing upon his immediate purpose, and the additional words, which occur in the second passage in the Chronicles, may originally have formed part of the account contained in the Book of Samuel, for it is universally acknowledged that there is a gap in the history at this place, *Keil*, Chr. p. 211.)—V. 7. Because David dwelt in the castle it was called the city of David; according to Samuel, David himself gave it this name.—V. 8. *Round about; from Millo, even to the circuit* (that is to say, within the circumference of a circle, which was drawn from Millo and returned to it again. In Samuel this is more briefly expressed by "David built *round about from Millo*," to which are added the words, *and inwards, i.e.*, from this circumference towards the centre. (*Thenius* explains the passage somewhat differently. He supposes that the word *inwards* refers to the northern wall of Zion, and the expression, "*round about from Millo*," to the fortification of the western, eastern, and southern sides of Zion; but *round about* can only denote the circumference of a circle which enclosed the northern side.) *Then he built the city*, by which of course we are to understand the city of David just named. *He built* must therefore mean he fortified and filled it with houses. *Millo*, a fortress probably on the north-western side of Zion, the point at which it would be most exposed to an attack, on account of its very slight elevation above the surrounding country. *And Joab restored* (Angl. margin *revived*) the rest of the city. The word חיה is used in a similar connection in Nehem. iii. 34 (iv. 3) to describe the restoration of buildings that had been destroyed, the rebuilding being regarded as a *restoration to life*, or even as a healing (1 Kings xviii. 30.) Hence the proper rendering would be *Joab restored the rest of the city*. The fact that Joab built certain portions of the city of David is not recorded anywhere else, but there is nothing at all surprising in the fact itself.

Thenius would alter the words from 1 Sam. 5 according to a modified conjecture of *Kennikott*, so as to read *Joab was governor of the city*, but apart from the fact that in this case we should expect to find the expression וַיּוֹאָב עַל הָעִיר (2 Sam. viii. 16), such a statement would be far less in character in a verse, which treats of the rebuilding of the city, than the clause in the text, which there is not the least occasion to alter.—V. 9. The words, *then David went, &c.*, indicate the point of time, from which his becoming great, first dates: *then* (from the conquest of Jerusalem), David *became continually greater and greater.* הָלוֹךְ before another infinitive frequently occurs in Genesis with the meaning to advance, *e.g.* Gen. viii. 3—5. *And Jehovah of Zebaoth was with him*, cf. chap. ix. 20; in 2 Sam. v. we find the fuller title *Jehovah God of Zebaoth.*

3. CHAP. XI. 10—47.

LIST OF DAVID'S HEROES, AND BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THEIR DEEDS.

Compare 2 Sam. xxiii. 8—39.—V. 10. For "*these are the leading heroes*" we find in Samuel "*these are the names*," probably the earlier reading, as the author of the Chronicles was especially concerned to introduce them as the *heads* of the Gibborim. In the book of Samuel the brief superscription, *these are the names of the heroes who had followed* David, is immediately succeeded by the list itself; but in the passage before us the heroes are still further described as those, *who had shown themselves strong in their association with him* (cf. Dan. x. 21) *during his rule, together with all Israel, in that they made him king, &c.* In these words the historian assigns a reason for introducing the list in question immediately after his account of the election of David as king, and the conquest of Jerusalem; namely, that they assisted in making David king. In the original form of the list and the connection in which it occurs in Samuel (2 Sam. xxiii.), there is no reference to the choice of a king, and even in the Chronicles it is only in the clause introduced into the superscription that such a reference occurs.—V. 11. The brief super-

scription in v. 10 is repeated here in a different form, viz., *and this is* (lit. these are) *the number of the heroes*. The occurrence of the word *mispar* is striking here, partly because the plural pronoun would lead us to expect a different word, and partly because the *number* of the heroes, which *is* given in 2 Sam. xxiii. 39, is not mentioned here at all. We might be inclined to suggest an alteration in the text from Ex. xv. 4, and the substitution of מִבְחָר. The passage would then read, "*these are the most distinguished of the heroes.*"

Vv. 11—14. *The three renowned heroes, Jashob'am, El'azar, and Shamma.—Jashob'am the son of Chacmoni.* There is nothing strange in the fact that the same *Jashob'am* is called in chap. xxvii. 2 a son of *Zabdiel*, for if Zabdiel belonged to the family of Chacmoni, his son might also be called a son of Chacmoni (cf. chap. xxvii. 32.) Instead of the *chief of the captains*, the reading of the Kethib (*the chief of the thirty*) is to be preferred (cf. vv. 15, 25; chap. xii. 4, 18, and xxvii. 6). *He lifted up his spear*; this is evidently the original reading, and is supported by 2 Sam. xxiii. 18. The words as they stand in the parallel passage of Samuel (v. 8) are quite unintelligible. *He brandished his spear*, continuing to raise it again and again, till the three hundred were slain *at one time*, that is in one day, and one after another. Instead of three hundred, the number given in Samuel is eight hundred, and according to all the versions that is the correct reading of the text. *Thenius* pronounces this the more probable account of the two, because the number three hundred occurs again further on in connection with Abishai (v. 20); and Jashob'am, who occupies the first place in the list, must certainly have distinguished himself by a feat superior to that of Abishai. *Ewald* on the other hand (Gesch. ii. p. 603) decides that three hundred is the original number, as it not likely that Jashob'am did more than his superior Abishai; cf. v. 21.—V. 11. El'azar the *Ahothite*; this is the correct reading, cf. chap. xxvii. 4, not *the son of the Ahothite* as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 9. He was בְּשָׁלִשָׁה הַגִּבֹּרִים *among the three heroes*; the numeral, as frequently happens, is not in the construct state; but placed before the noun in the form of an adverb. We find the same construction in v. 24 and 2 Sam. xxxiii. 9 (Keri) 22. The three heroes referred to here are Jashob'am and El'azar, who are mentioned in vv. 11—12,

and Shamma, whose name, through some oversight, has been omitted from the list, see below at v. 13. It is worthy of note that these three are spoken of as pre-eminently *the three heroes*. *Thenius* is of opinion that if the author intended to say *the three heroes*, he would have written שלשת הגברים, like 2 Sam. xxiii. 16—17, and v. 19 of the chapter before us. But, however strange it may appear that the numeral שלשה occurs in two different connections in the same list, they are both grammatically admissible. Nor do we find any difficulty in the fact that the author has hitherto said nothing about a triad of heroes, for if three heroes are named one after another, and one of them is spoken of as associated with two others, no reader could possibly think of any but the three whose names are given. We see no occasion, therefore, for altering the text, as *Thenius* suggests, so as to read *he was among the Shalishim* (the knights) *of the heroes*, an alteration to which we could not assent for this reason, if for no other, that we read nothing about Shalishim anywhere else in the list in the Chronicles.—V. 13. The account of the exploit, to which he owed his renown, is introduced by the words, "*it was he who was with David, &c.*" As the omission of these words makes the passage obscure, they have probably been left out of the parallel verse in Samuel through an oversight of the copyist. According to the *Septuagint* (Ald, Compl.) they did originally form part of the text.—*Pas-dammim:* the same place as we meet with in 1 Sam. xvii. 1 under the name of *Ephes-dammim*. It is there described as situated between Shocoh and Azeka, that is, in the western districts of the province of Judah. The name is left out of the list in 2 Sam., xxiii., but there are several places, especially v. 9, in which the text of that chapter must be amended from the Chronicles.—After the words, "*and the Philistines were gathered together to battle*," several verses have fallen out of our text, which for the sake of the connection we give from 2 Sam. xxiii. 9—11: *then the Israelites went up* (leaving the battle-field to retreat into the mountains) *whereas he stood firm. And he smote the Philistines till his hand was numbed, and his hand clung to the sword. And Jehovah effected a great deliverance that day, and the people returned* (from their flight) *to him for the sake of the spoil* (the victory having been decided by him alone.) *And*

after him followed Shamma ben Age the Hararite, and the Philistines had assembled near Lechi, viz., at the spot where Samson once smote the Philistines (Judg. xv. 9 sqq.). The continuation is given in our text: *and there was a piece of land there full of barley.* The omission of so long a passage, which has fallen out of the text through an oversight, was probably occasioned by the recurrence of precisely the same words, "*and the Philistines had assembled together to battle*," in such close connection (2 Sam. xxiii. 9 and 11). For *barley* we find in Samuel *lentils*. The difference probably arose from a transposition in the letters of the original word. It was of great importance to preserve the field of barley, which the Philistines wanted to destroy, but the Israelites took to flight.—V. 14. "*Then* Shamma *maintained his ground in the midst of the field, and saved it, and smote the Philistines.*" We have rendered the three verbs in the singular instead of the plural; we find them in the singular in Samuel, and the context absolutely requires it.—And Jehovah *saved them.* The word *saved* is not inappropriate here, but as the parallel passage in Samuel reads *Jehovah wrought* a great victory, and the rendering of the Septuagint in the passage before us is καὶ ἐποίησε, the latter must be regarded as the original reading. (The discrepancy between the two passages is explained by *Keil* in precisely the same way as by *Bertheau*. He says: "in both passages there are evidently copyists' errors and corruptions, *e.g.* in v. 13 of the Chronicles nearly two whole verses have been left out between the words 'to battle,' and 'where was a piece of ground.' The missing verses are found in 2 Sam. xxiii. 9—11. Thus, through the omission of the name of Shamma, a heroic exploit is ascribed to Eleazar, which was really performed by Shamma." *Keil* Chronik. p. 211, 212).

Vv. 15—19. *Account of the three heroes, who fetched water for David.*—V. 15. שְׁלֹשָׁה (*three*) occurs in 2 Sam. (Keri) also without the article. We might easily be induced to conjecture, that the article *was* originally prefixed to the numeral, as the names of three heroes have just been given, and it is a very natural supposition that we have here an account of a brave exploit, which was performed in concert by the same three, especially when we consider that, according to the superscription in Samuel, it was the intention of the author to give the *names*

of the heroes mentioned by him, and here we have no names at all. Still we have some hesitation about inserting the article, for the more probable supposition is, that three different heroes are referred to here. In the verse before us they are more particularly described as *three of the thirty captains*, and such a description would have been unnecessary in the case of the three already known, Jashobam, El'azar, and Shamma. As the word שלשים is followed by ראש in the singular, it is evident that the former must be the numeral 30. It is important to observe this if we are desirous of holding fast the original signification of the word. —*And three of the thirty went down to David on the rock at the cave of Adullam;* the rock was that upon which the fortress stood (v. 16), and the cave of Adullam must either have been in the rock itself or somewhere in the neighbourhood. The *valley of Rephaim* was to the west of Jerusalem, how far it ran in a southern direction we cannot exactly determine.—V. 16. The Philistines, who were encamped in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, had pushed forward an outpost as far as to Bethlehem, and according to v. 18 it was stationed in front of that town.— V. 17. There is very beautiful water not far from Bethlehem, but *Robinson* looked in vain for a well *in the gate* of the town (ii. p. 378). At length he found one inside the town, that was connected with the aqueduct to the south of Bethlehem. About a quarter of an hour's walk to the north-east of the town there is a large deep cistern or cave, which is now dry, with three or four small openings cut in the rock. According to tradition this was the well, whose water David desired to drink. The description given here, according to which there was a well in the gate, does not agree with either the situation of the wells or the position of the gate in modern Bethlehem.—V. 18. *They broke through the camp*, not the camp referred to in v. 15, for if this were meant, the valley of Rephaim must have lain between the fortress and the town of Bethlehem. *Thenius* infers from this passage that it did extend thus far to the south, but such a supposition is not favoured by other accounts of the situation of the valley, and in that case there would have been no necessity for the historian to say anything of the outpost in Bethlehem, which is expressly mentioned in v. 16 as distinct from the camp referred to in v. 15. The camp, through which they broke, was the encampment of

this outpost, which kept possession of the space in front of the gate of the town.—*Then they brought it* (the water) *to David; and he poured it on the ground to Jehovah*, thereby confessing that the water, which had been procured by the three heroes at the risk of their life, was far too valuable to be employed for any ordinary purpose.—V. 19. *Shall I drink the blood of these men in their souls.* (The verb "shall I drink" is omitted from 2 Sam. xxiii., but undoubtedly formed part of the original text.) *The expression blood in their souls* reminds us of Gen. ix. 4; Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, xvii. 10 sqq., xix. 26 seq.; Deut. xii. 6, and of the command not to eat flesh in its blood, or in its soul and blood. Of these passages, Lev. xvii. 11 and 14 seem the most likely to throw light upon the verse before us, for the phrase *blood in the soul* and *in its soul* apparently corresponds to the expression employed here. But we are unable to bring the words "*blood in its soul*" into harmony with the more definite expressions which we find used on other occasions. According to these the soul is in the blood or the soul is the blood, and the difficult passages in Leviticus (xvii. 11 and 14) must be similarly explained. The blood is the seat of the *Nephesh*, but we do not see how this can be also the seat of the blood. The phrase *blood in their souls*, therefore, is still enigmatical; *blood with their souls*, as the earlier expositors rendered it, is not in the text, for בְּ does not mean *with*. As the words "*in their souls*" only occur once in 2 Sam. xxiii. 17, we are of opinion that in the original text of the Chronicles also it was only written once, and that it has been repeated by mistake. The question, "*shall I drink the blood of these men?*" is fully explained by the words which follow: *when for their souls they have brought the water* (*i.e.*, having given their souls as it were as the price of the water). The water, which had been obtained at the risk of their lives, or by offering up their souls, is valued at the price of their souls; but the soul is equivalent to the blood, and therefore to drink the water would be the same as drinking the blood of the men. But if blood could not be shed upon the altar, it was to be poured out upon the ground like water, Deut. xii. 16; and thus did David take the water, which he regarded as equivalent to the blood of his heroes, and pour it upon the ground. In the parallel passage in Samuel the words read thus: (shall I drink) *the blood*

of the men who went at the risk of their lives; but in the text of the Chronicles the clause, *who went at the risk of their lives,* is so altered as to assign the reason, *for they have brought the water for their souls,* and thus an explanation is furnished of the bold expression *the blood of the heroes.* It must not be supposed that David acted as he did with any reference to the prohibition to eat blood; still it was necessary to mention this prohibition, since the representation, which it gives of the importance and nature of the blood, serves to strengthen our explanation.

Vv. 20—25. *Abishai and Benaiah.*—V. 20. *Abishai* was one of the three sons of Zeruiah. Like Jashobam, he lifted up his spear against 300 men and slew them. *He was the head of the Sheloshah,* or, as it is stated in v. 21, *he was their prince.* If we take Sheloshah here to be a numeral, we must distinguish between these three, of whom he was the head, and the other three to whom he did not attain (v. 21). It is true that we read of twice three heroes in the previous verses, and it might therefore be supposed that Abishai was the head of the three mentioned in vv. 15—19, whilst he was inferior to the three referred to in vv. 11—14, viz., Jashobam, El'azar, and Shamma. But, however natural it may appear to reconcile the statements contained in the verses before us, by supposing that there were two distinct triads of heroes, it could easily be shown that this would not answer the purpose intended. The difficulties, in our opinion, can only be removed on the supposition that Sheloshah has two different meanings in these verses, viz., that of a numeral *three,* and that of an abstract noun *the whole of the thirty.* Our reason for giving the latter meaning to the word is founded upon a comparison of v. 21 with v. 25, and of 2 Sam. xxiii. 19 with v. 23, for it is evident from these verses that Sheloshah and Sheloshim are employed to denote a larger company, in which both Abishai and Benaiah occupied a prominent position. Hence we should render the passage in question thus: *he was the head of the Sheloshah-company, and to him* (לוֹ is another mode of writing לָהּ, according to the Keri, to v. 24, and to 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, 23) *there was a name in the Sheloshah-company, i.e.,* he was one of its most distinguished members.—V. 21. *Of the three among two he was regarded;* very obscure words, which are sometimes interpreted as meaning: *he was renowned among the three of the*

second rank (Vulgate, *et inter tres secundos inclytus*), or *of the three he was renowned above two* (LXX. ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο ἔνδοξος), in other words he was more renowned than the other two who were associated with him in the same triad. But the expression *among two* does not occur in 2 Samuel xxiii. 14; and it may very possibly have been interpolated here from a wish to elucidate the narrative by distinguishing one triad from the other. Moreover, there is no such expression in v. 25 of this chapter, where exactly the same sentence occurs again. Hence we must adopt the reading of 2 Sam. xxiii., "*of the Shelosha-company he was truly renowned* (we take הֲכִי in the sense in which it occurs in Genesis xxvii. 36, xxix. 15, cf. 2 Sam. ix. 1), *and he became their leader, but to the three* (mentioned in vv. 11—14), *he did not attain*" (compare v. 25.)—V. 22. *Benaiah* (chap. xviii. 17, xxvii. 6) *the son of a valiant man.* This can hardly have been the description given of Benaiah, who is called the *son of Jehoiada* immediately before. The word *Ben* (son) is out of place here. It is Benaiah himself who is called a *valiant man, great in deeds.*—*Kabzeel*: a town in the south of Judah, Josh. xv. 21; Nehem. xi. 25.—The word *Ben*, which we dropt before "a valiant man," should evidently have stood as a plural before אריאל: which would then read thus: *he slew the two sons of Ariel of Moab.* Ariel, *lion of God*, appears from this to have been a title of honour given to the king of Moab. This feat of Benaiah was probably performed in the war between David and the Moabites, recorded in 2 Sam. viii. 2. *He also went down* (into the well) *and slew the lion in the midst of the well, when snow had fallen*; that is to say, in winter-time, when a heavy fall of snow had brought the lion into the neighbourhood of the dwelling houses, where it had taken refuge in a well.—*He also slew the Egyptian man, a man of stature*; the Septuagint renders this, after 2 Sam. xxiii. 21, ἄνδρα ὁρατόν, *a man of renown*: either a *distinguished man* or *a man to look at* (a great man). The latter is the more probable meaning from the next clause, "five cubits high," which does not occur in Samuel. *And in his hand was a spear*, according to the passage before us *like a weaver's beam*, but according to the *Septuagint* rendering of 2 Sam. xxiii. 21, ὡς ξύλον διαβάθρας. In the latter passage there must originally have been some expression

of this kind, for the mere fact that a spear was in his hand would not be worthy of any special notice; and there is something so peculiar in the comparison between a heavy spear and a beam from a bridge, that it was most probably the original reading.—*And he went down* to the place of combat (1 Sam. xxvi. 10, xxix. 4) *with the stick*, *sc.* which he happened to have in his hand at the time.—V. 24. The word *Shelosha* in the text is written *plene*; according to v. 20, however, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, it should be written *defective*: *he was renowned in the Shelosha-company*. The words of the text mean, *he was renowned among the three heroes*, cf. v. 12.—Vl. 25. *Among the Sheloshim*, or in the Shelosha-company, *behold he was renowned, but he did not attain to the three* (cf. v. 21), *and David set him over his body-guard*. The same expression occurs in 2 Sam. xxiii. 23 (cf. 1 Sam. xxii. 14), and it is evident from 2 Sam. viii. 18 and xx. 23, that the Kreti and Pleti were the guard intended. This body-guard was a small, distinct corps, which received its orders direct from the king, and remained in attendance upon his person, in constant readiness to execute his commands. Hence *his obedience* (the literal meaning of the word), those who were immediately subject to him, were not placed upon the same footing as the rest of the troops, but held a position peculiar to themselves. It is only in this passage and the parallel verse in Samuel that the word occurs as a technical term with this precise meaning, though it is also found in 1 Sam. xxii. 14 and Is. xi. 14, and for that very reason we should be careful how we think of altering it.

On reviewing the whole section, vv. 11—25, the question arises, whether the *Shalishim*, &c., referred to here, are the same as the *Shalishim* or *chariot-soldiers*, who are occasionally mentioned (*e.g.*, in 2 Kings x. 25) by the side of the *Razim* or *runners*, and one of whom was frequently employed as a kind of adjutant in immediate attendance upon the king (2 Kings vii. 2, 17, 19, ix. 25, xv. 25 cf.; 2 Chr. viii. 9; Ezek. xxiii. 15, 23). In our opinion the question must be answered in the negative; for whilst the words *Shelosha*, *Shelosha haggeborim*, and *Sheloshim* occur very frequently, *Shalishim* is only used once, viz., in v. 11, in the Keri, and even there the reading of the Kethib, *Sheloshim*, which is so strongly supported by the following verses, ought not to be relinquished. Now if we consider how easy it

is to account for the opinion that the celebrated warriors, the Shalishim, were referred to here, and bear in mind the frequency with which *vav* and *yod* are interchanged, we shall feel that there is very little weight in the passages in which *Shalishim* and *Shalishi* occur, especially as the reading is not well established in any one of these passages, *Sheloshim* or *Shelosha* being invariably found in the Kethib or else in the parallel passages. Hence we cannot subscribe to the opinion of *Thenius*, who starts with the supposition that the persons described in this section belonged to the warriors who were known by the name of the Shalishim. "The frequent occurrence of this word," he says, "in the section before us has escaped the notice of commentators solely because it has been changed into Sheloshim or Shelosha, which has been erroneously regarded as the true reading." We are forced to adopt exactly the opposite conclusion, and to pronounce *Sheloshim* and *Shelosha* correct. The connection, already pointed out, between the two readings would be quite sufficient to justify us in coming to such a conclusion, but to this it must also be added that, if we remember rightly, the Shalishim are not mentioned anywhere else in the history of David, whereas the Sheloshim are spoken of in 1 Chr. xi. 42, xii. 4, xxvii. 6, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 24. Now there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the word *Sheloshim*. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 and 1 Chr. xi. 15 it means *thirty*, and denotes a company of distinguished warriors, whilst particular heroes are not infrequently described as belonging to it. They stood at the head of other warriors as chiefs, and are called the thirty captains or heads in 1 Chr. xi. 15; Jashobam was the head of the thirty, v. 11, and Abishai also was their head and prince, v. 20. The plural form Sheloshim is used interchangeably with the feminine singular *Sheloshah* (compare v. 25 and v. 21), and however strange this interchange may appear, it is possible to explain it, since the plural Sheloshim, when used to denote a particular company of thirty individuals, was regarded in fact as a substantive, which might be formed directly from Shelosh through the feminine termination. So much at any rate is indisputable, that Sheloshah does not mean *three* in every place in which it occurs in the verses before us, but also means a *company of thirty*, and it would be an arbitrary thing on our part to assume that the reading is false, and to substitute Shelo-

shim, wherever it is used in the latter signification. If, however, we give to Sheloshah the same meaning as to Sheloshim, the verses in our opinion may be easily understood without any alteration, the only ambiguity arising from the fact that *Sheloshah* is also used with the meaning *three*. In the list in question, then, after amending the text from 2 Sam. xxiii., we find, *in the first place*, the names of *three heroes*: Jashob'am, *the head of the thirty*, El'azar, who also belonged to these *three heroes*, and Shamma. *Secondly*, in vv. 16—19 a short account is given of three, whose names are not given, and who did not belong *to the thirty heroes*. In v. 19 they are described as *three heroes*. *Thirdly*, in vv. 20—25 two heroes are named. The first is Abishai the head of the *Shelosha* (the company of thirty), who was renowned and *distinguished in the Shelosha* (or, according to v. 25 among the thirty). He was also *their leader*, but did not attain to the *three* heroes named before. The second is Benaiah (cf. chap. xxvii. 6), who was *renowned and distinguished among the thirty*, but did not attain to the three heroes already named. It is somewhat striking that, according to this, Jashob'am the *head of the thirty* and Abishai the *head of the Shelosha* held precisely the same rank. But the latter is also called the prince of the thirty, and hence, if there be an objection to the supposition that they held the same office at different times, the one succeeding to it on the death of the other, the title of "*head*" may have been given to the one because he was the most distinguished for his bravery, and to the other because he was the actual leader. We have no account in the historical books of the exact rank of these thirty in David's army. It might be conjectured that they were the leaders of the six hundred men who are spoken of in 1 Sam. xxiii. 13, xxv. 13, xxx. 10, and 2 Sam. xv. 18; in which case there would have been an officer for every twenty men. These six hundred men formed the body guard of David, as we find from 2 Sam. xvi. 6, and were called in a peculiar sense הַגִּבֹּרִים (the mighty men), 2 Sam. x. 7, xvi. 6, xx. 7, cf. 1 Kings i. 8, 10; see *Thenius* in 2 Sam. xv. 18, *Ewald*, Gesh. des. V. Israel p. 600 sqq.

Vv. 26—47. *List of forty-eight of the leaders in David's army.* (As we have here merely a list of names, and nearly all of them are entirely unknown, we omit the author's notes on this passage

with the exception of the following remarks with which he concludes.—TR.) If we add the name of Elika, which has evidently fallen out of v. 27, as we may see from 2 Sam. xxiii. 25, the number of the names from v. 26 to Uriah the Hittite in v. 41 is thirty-two, and from v. 41 to 47 sixteen, making together forty-eight, a number which is in itself a proof of the completeness of the list. The names of the three heroes (vv. 11—14) and nine of the names which occur in vv. 26—30, twelve in all, are given again in chap. xxvii. as the names of the leaders of the twelve divisions of the army.—Of the heroes mentioned in vv. 26—41 the greater part belonged to the provinces of Judah and Benjamin, as the list itself clearly shows; on the other hand the sixteen names which occur in vv. 41—47 are all associated with places that are altogether unknown, or with cities and districts on the east of the Jordan. The tribes inhabiting the north of Palestine do not appear to have furnished any leaders, and even Ephraim is but feebly represented.

4. CHAP. XII. 1—22.

LIST OF THOSE WHO ATTACHED THEMSELVES TO DAVID DURING THE LIFETIME OF SAUL.

Three separate lists, which are only found here, vv. 1—7, vv. 8—17, and vv. 19—22. The men are classified according to the time of their going over to David.

Vv. 1—7. *Benjaminites and men of Judah, who came to David when he was in Ziklag* (cf. 1 Sam. xxvii.).—V. 1. *He was still restrained from the face*; a brief mode of expression for: at the time when he was still prohibited from appearing in the presence of Saul. *War auxiliaries*; according to vv. 17, 18, 21, 22, an honourable title given to those who had been ready to assist David in his previous wars.—V. 2. (cf. Judg. iii. 15, and xix. seq.). נשקי קשת (2 Chr. xvii. 17) men who *shot with the bow*, practised archers like דרכי קשת, chap. viii. 40. *With the right and left hand*, they were *skilled in* (throwing) *stones and* (shooting) *arrows upon the bow*.—*Brethren of Saul*; are they called Saul's brethren because they were Benjaminites, *i.e.*, men-

bers of the same tribe, or were they more closely related to him? As the words "*of Benjamin*" follow immediately after, a comparison of v. 29 with the verse before us, will show that we must decide in favour of the former.—V. 4. *Ishmaya of Gibeon* (2 Sam. xxi. 1 sqq.) *a hero among the thirty and leader of the thirty* (chap. xi. 42). In the MSS. and ancient editions, even that of R. Norzi, the 4th verse terminates here. It is evident from chap. viii. 29 and ix. 35 that not only the Canaanites, who were made servants of the congregation (Josh. ix.) but members of the tribe of Benjamin also dwelt at Gibeon. Of *Gadera;* are we to understand by this the town, which, according to Josh. xv. 36, was situated in the lowlands of Judah? As Gedor is mentioned immediately afterwards in v. 7, we must conclude that the list contains men of Judah as well as Benjamin.—V. 6. *The Korahites;* according to chap. ix. 19, 31, those who descended from Korah. As the name Korah occurs in chap. ii. 43, in the list of the tribe of Judah, but is not found anywhere else among the Benjaminites, and as we cannot suppose them to have been the Korahites of the tribes of Levi, we conclude that those mentioned here were a family of Judah. It is somewhat strange that we should find a plural form and the name of a family by the side of adjectives formed from the names of towns.—V. 7. *Gedor*, a town in Judah, to the southwest of Bethlehem (cf. chap. iv. 4).

Vv. 8—18. *List of men of the tribe of Gad, and an account of certain men of Judah and Benjamin, who attached themselves to David when he was staying in the fortress.*—Vv. 8—15. *The Gadites.* V. 8. *They separated themselves* (from the rest of the Gadites who were on the side of Saul).—*To the fortress towards the desert;* cf. v. 16, chap. xi. 16; 1 Sam. xxii. 4 and xxiii. 14. *Men of might;* vid. chap. xi. 26.—Strong and bold, *looking like lions* (2 Sam. i. 23), *and like roes hurrying* over *the hills* (2 Sam. ii. 18). The plural צבאים a later form for צְבָיִם.—V. 14. *Leaders of the army;* cf. v. 21, princes in the army. *One for a hundred the small one, and the greater for a thousand;* i.e., of the eleven heroes named, the weakest could stand against a hundred men, and the strongest against a thousand (cf. Lev. xxvi. 8). This is the explanation given by early Jewish expositors and also in the Septuagint. On the other hand, the *Vulgate* renders the passage *novissimus centum militibus praeerat et maximus mille*, but

the contrast between small and great does not favour this explanation, moreover if this were the meaning of the words, we should expect to find the preposition עַל rather than לְ. Moreover, the former rendering is decidedly favoured by the position of the word *one* at the commencement of the sentence immediately before לְמֵאָה, by which the contrast is heightened between *one* and *a hundred*. The expressions employed in v. 8 to describe their strength and swiftness remind us directly of similar expressions which are applied in the historical books to heroes of the time of David, and were undoubtedly taken from the original sources employed by our historian. Hence the question has been asked whether the words of the verse before us were also found there or were appended by the historian himself. It is impossible to give a positive answer to this question. But we are of opinion that the historian found them in the original record; for they have a very peculiar, we might almost say poetical character; no such expression occurs anywhere else in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as a description of personal bravery; and such passages as Lev. xxvi. 8 furnish a proof that in very early times extraordinary bravery and success in war were so described.—*It was they who went over the Jordan;* probably at the time when they separated from the rest of the Gadites and had to fight their way through the supporters of Saul to get to David.—*When it filled over all its banks:* as the verb filled is without an object, we must interpret the Piel as meaning *it made an overflowing*. In Josh. iii. 15, we find the participle Kal. *In the first month, i.e.*, in spring, when an immense body of water generally rushes in torrents down the Jordan to the Dead Sea. *And they put to flight all the valleys both on the east and on the west;* for though the river was swollen it did not prevent them from attacking their enemies on the western bank after they had defeated those on the east.—Vv. 16—18. *The men of Benjamin, and Judah*, who joined David in the fortress, were no doubt mentioned by name in the original sources, as well as the men of Gad, but the historian does not give their names, probably because many of the men, whom David is said in v. 18 to have made captains in his army, had been named in the list already given in chap. xi. We have merely an account of the conversation which took place previous to their admission into David's

army.—V. 17. *He went out to meet them*, vid. chap. xiv. 8. לִיחֻד only occurs in this passage: *there shall be to me towards you a heart for fellowship*, I will have with you *one* heart (compare v. 38, "one heart," and v. 33, "without a heart and a heart") and remain true to you. *And if* ye have come *to deal treacherously with me on behalf of my adversaries* (to deliver me to my adversaries) *although there is nothing wrong in my hands* (somewhat differently in Job xvi. 17, and Is. liii. 9), *may the God of our fathers behold and punish* (2 Chr. xxiv. 22); the God of our fathers is the God who has always manifested himself in Israel as the protector of the innocent, and who therefore will not let the men go unpunished if they have any evil design against David.—V. 18. *The Spirit came into Amasai.* In other places the usual expression is the Spirit of God (2 Chr. xxiv. 20), here we have "the Spirit" alone, as the intention of the author was chiefly to give prominence to the fact that Amasai spoke under the influence of inspiration, and not after reflection and with hesitation. The whole context is sufficient to show that the inspiration did not proceed from an evil source. Among the earlier expositors some regarded the spirit as a spirit of bravery (*Syriac*), others as a spirit of willingness and vehement desire (*Kimchi*), others again as a spirit of impatience; *Lavater* as the Spirit of God which impelled him to give the answer he did. The name *Amasai* reminds us of Amasah, the son of Abigail the sister of David (chap. ii. 17), and also of Abishai, the son of Zeruiah the sister of David (chap. ii. 16, xi. 20), though not so directly of the latter. Earlier expositors have expressed the opinion that he was one of these two, and as it is probable that Amasai, who played so important part on this occasion, appears elsewhere in the history of David, there is certainly some ground for the conjecture that he was the same person as the Amasa of the books of Samuel.—*To thee, O David:* we have no difficulty in completing the sentence by "we belong;" thine we are, *and with thee, O son of Jesse*, we will fight in concert. *Peace be to thee, and peace to every one who helps thee, for thy God*, who has stood by thy side in thy former successful wars (1 Sam. xviii. 12, 14), *helpeth thee*, and will not forsake thee. The last words of the verse, *then David received them, and placed them at the head of*

the army, are to be regarded as the words of the historian, since ויקבלם is a word belonging to a later age.

Vv. 19—22. *List of seven men of the tribe of Manasseh*, who joined David, when he was dismissed by the Philistines from their army, on the occasion of their last battle with Saul, and returned to Ziklag; cf. 1 Sam. xxix.—V. 19. *They fell to David*; cf. xx.; 2 Kings xxv. 11. *And David and his men did not help the Philistines* (1 Sam. xxix. 2). *Upon advisement* (Prov. xxi 18), that is to say with forethought and after deliberation, *the princes of the Philistines had sent him away*. בראשיהו (according to 1 Sam. xxix. 4) *for our heads*, inasmuch as he will not hesitate to give up our heads as the price of a friendly reception on the part of Saul, *he will fall away to his master, Saul*.—V. 20. *When he returned to Ziklag*; they probably went over to him before the battle, and accompanied him to Ziklag. *Ewald* (Gesch. ii. p. 569) imagines that they did not go over till after Saul's defeat. I think, however, that a comparison of the words "as he went to Ziklag" with 1 Sam. xxix. 11 compels us to decide in favour of the former, though the statements are not made with such precision and clearness as to prevent any uncertainty in this respect. The seven men were *heads of the thousands belonging to Manasseh*, that is to say, they were heads of the larger military divisions of the tribe of Manasseh; compare the princes of thousands, who are mentioned in chap. xv. 25 by the side of the elders of Israel, and the passages in which the princes over thousands are named along with those over hundreds, chap. xiii. 1, xxvi. 26, xxvii. 1, &c. It is evident from the Pentateuch (*e.g.* Num. xxxi. 14) that in the very earliest times the tribes were divided into hundreds and thousands, and that the heads of these divisions had a settled official position in the general organisation of the tribes.—V. 21. *They assisted in concert with David against the army* of the Amalekites; thus taking part in the first military expedition, which was undertaken by David, after his return to Ziklag. This explanation of the brief and unintelligible words of the text is founded upon 1 Sam. xxx. 8, 15, where the same word גדוד is used to describe the army of the Amalekites. The *Vulgate* renders the passage *hi praebuerunt auxilium David adversus latrunculos*, the *Septuagint* καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν

μάχησαν τῷ Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τὸν Γεδδούρ, we have here a different reading of the last word, which was regarded as a proper name. The question still remains, whether הֵמָּה in the verse before us refers to the seven Manassites, or to all the heroes spoken of in vv. 1—20. As it was not the Manassites alone who took part in the attack upon Amalek, but David obtained the victory with *all* his army (the 600 men of 1 Sam. xxx. 9), which undoubtedly included those who are named in vv. 1—18,—a marked distinction being made between those who attached themselves to David, and assisted him during the earlier period (the helpers of David mentioned in vv. 1, 17, 22) and those who came to him at Hebron, v. 23,—moreover, as the general statement made in v. 22 is connected by כִּי with v. 21, we conclude that vv. 21 and 22 are appended as a supplementary remark to the whole of the preceding list: *and they*, viz., all those named after v. 1, *assisted* [illegible] *for they were all heroic warriors, and they were princes in the army*, and thus it came to pass that David was at the head of a powerful army even when he was in Ziklag,—v. 22, *for daily there came to David to help him* (so many, that the number increased) *to a great camp like a camp of God*. The simile evidently refers to its size: cf. "the mountains and cedars of God," Ps. xxxvi. 7, lxxx. 11; Jonah iii. 3, is not so evidently a case in point.

[illegible]

5. CHAP. XII. 23—40.

NUMBER OF THE WARRIORS WHO ELECTED DAVID KING IN HEBRON.

We have here a more detailed description of the same assembly, of which a brief notice is found in chap. xi. 1—3. From what source the present account was derived it is impossible to say. It is probable, however, that we have here an extract from a complete list of the warriors who assembled in Hebron, for the superscription in v. 23 announces a statement of *the number of the men equipped for the army, who assembled at Hebron*; whereas the verses which follow contain not the number of the heads, but the number of warriors belonging to the different tribes, and it is

quite as an exception that we find the leaders of the tribe of Levi mentioned in vv. 26—28. The supposition that the heading can be brought into harmony with the list itself, by rendering מספרי ראשי the *number of heads* or individuals, is incorrect, for ראשי before הַחֲלוּץ, according to the settled usage of the language, always means the heads or leaders of the army, and the word גֻּלְגֹּלֶת is employed to denote the number of heads in the sense of individuals, *e.g.*, 1 Chr. xxiii. 3, 24. Our only resource then is to assume that the heading originally belonged to a list, which was arranged throughout like vv. 26—28, *i.e.* which contained the names and number of the chiefs and also the number of the warriors. *To turn the kingdom;* cf. chap. x. 14.—*According to the mouth of Jehovah:* cf. according to the word of Jehovah, chap. xi. 3, 10.—V. 24. The account commences with the two tribes inhabiting the southern portion of the land, Judah and Simeon; they are followed by Levi, whose leading forces and principal representatives were undoubtedly concentrated in the province of Judah and had attached themselves to David. Proceeding in a northerly direction the list embraces the rest of the tribes in the country to the west of the Jordan, and concludes with the two tribes and a half on the east of the river.—V. 27. *Jehoiada* is called *the prince for Aaron.* This, cannot mean that he was the *high priest*, as the office of high priest was filled by Abiathar (1 Sam. xxiii. 9). הנגיד must, therefore, mean the leader of the warriors of the house of Aaron. It has been thought that this Jehoiada was the father of Benaiah, chap. xi. 22.—*Zadok*, who was still but a youth, may very well have been the descendant of the El'azar mentioned in chap. v. 34, who was appointed to the office of high priest during the reign of Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 26.—*And his father's house two and twenty princes*, all of whom belonged to the family of El'azar, which was, therefore, very large and powerful at that time.—V. 29. Benjamin sent only 3000 men, a comparatively small number, *for hitherto* (chap. ix. 18) *the mass*, *i.e.*, the greater number of the Benjaminites had been careful guardians of the house of Saul. It is worthy of notice that, according to this statement, even after the death of Ishbosheth, a large part of the tribe of Benjamin hesitated to acknowledge David as king.—V. 30. On comparing chap. v. 24 we might be led to conjecture, that the

words "*heads of*" originally stood before the "house of their fathers," were it not that the number had just been stated at 20,800. And not only are they all described as *brave heroes*, but as *celebrated men*, which is somewhat remarkable; a similar description occurs in v. 31. לְבֵית אֲבוֹתָם can hardly mean celebrated men of their fathers'-houses, or in their fathers' houses, but arranged *according to their fathers'-houses* (chap. v. 13.)—V. 31. The half-tribe of Manasseh on the west of the Jordan furnished 18,000 men, who *were levied by name* (chap. xvi. 41; Num. i. 17) *to go and make David king*. The meaning of these words probably is, that there were lists drawn up containing the names of the whole 18,000.—V. 32. To the statement that from Issachar there came to Hebron *men who were wise* (2 Chr. ii. 12) *with regard to the times so as to see what Israel ought to do*, we find nothing analogous in the whole of the Old Testament. Some of the earlier expositors infer from it, that the tribe of Issachar was distinguished above the rest of the tribes for an acquaintance with astronomical and physical science, by which it was enabled to predict the course of events. The learning of this tribe is no doubt particularly referred to here, because it was a matter of great importance that not only the military tribes, but the tribe which was celebrated for its scientific attainments and also for its sound judgment in political questions, declared for David. We have no means, however, of explaining how it was that Issachar attained its pre-eminence in this respect, and how the "strong ass" of Gen. xlix. 14 became the wise one in discerning times.—*Two hundred heads and all their brethren acting according to their mouth*; *i.e.*, cheerfully following their commands, Gen. xli. 40; Num. iv. 27; Deut. xxi. 5.—V. 33. וְלֹא בְלֵבָב וָלֵב only occurs here and in v. 38; in the same connection in both passages. It has been supposed by some to mean: to fall into rank, by others to congregate together. The expression *without heart and heart* (a double heart) suits these explanations very well, as *v.* 38 clearly shows: falling into rank, or congregating together *not with a double heart*, *i.e.*, with a firm and faithful mind. Nine MSS. read לְעֶזֶר *to help with a faithful heart*; LXX. *βοηθῆσαι τῷ Δαυὶδ οὐ χεροκένως*, *Vulg. venerunt in auxilium non in corde duplici*. It does not follow from these renderings that the Septua-

gint and the Vulgate adopted the latter reading, they may have taken the reading of our text and translated it *to help* according to the Aramaean form. Vv. 17, 21, and 22 appear to favour this rendering; but (1) the meaning *to help* is totally unsuitable to *v.* 38; (2) there is no ground for attaching such a meaning to the verb עזר in this passage, seeing that the root עזר *to help* occurs several times in the chapter before us; (3) it would be necessary to alter the reading in this verse and *v.* 38 and we may well hesitate before assuming that the text is thus faulty in two places; and hence we are forced to the conclusion that the received reading must be retained as the correct one.—V. 38. Concluding remarks with reference to the whole section from *v.* 23.—*And all the rest of Israel were agreed in heart* (2 Chr. xxx. 12), *i.e.*, had one common wish, *to make David king.*—V. 39. *Their brethren brought them provisions;* Gen. xliii. 16; 2 Chr. xxxv. 14 seq.—V. 40. *And those also who were living near them* (Deut. xiii. 8), in fact not merely those who dwelt in the immediate neighbourhood of Hebron, but those who lived as far off as the borders of the provinces of *Issachar, Zebulon, and Naphtali*, supplied the Israelites, who were assembled in Hebron, with food, without any regard to distinctions of tribe and other associations, bringing a great abundance of provisions upon beasts of burden, for *there was joy in Israel*, and therefore every one did his best to make the assembly in Hebron a festival of rejoicing (cf. 2 Chr. xxx. 23 sqq.). According to the account given in the verses before us more than 300,000 armed men took part in the assembly at Hebron. We are not surprised at the large number of Israelites who took part in this assembly, but we are struck with the disproportion in the numbers of the representatives of the different tribes. Judah, the tribe of David, which had been from the earliest times the most numerous and powerful tribe, sent 6,800 men; from Zebulon, on the other hand, there were 50,000. Naphtali contributed 1,000 princes at the head of 37,000 warriors, and the two tribes and a half from the east of the Jordan sent 120,000 men. How did it happen that Zebulon and Naphtali, two tribes which never played an important part in the history of Israel, were so numerously represented, whilst Judah sent so comparatively small a band of warriors? The question immediately arises

whether the numbers are precise and accurate as we have them here. But we are unable to answer this question, as the account contained in these verses furnishes no test, by which the accuracy of the various details may be determined, and the number of those who were present at the assembly in Hebron is not mentioned anywhere else in the Old Testament.

6. Chap. xiii.—xvi.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT IS TAKEN TO THE HOUSE OF OBED-EDOM AND REMAINS THERE THREE MONTHS, CHAP. XIII. (ACCOUNT OF DAVID'S PREPARATIONS FOR BUILDING A HOUSE, OF HIS FAMILY AND OF HIS WARS WITH THE PHILISTINES, CHAP. XIV.), THE ARK IS THEN CARRIED BY THE LEVITES TO JERUSALEM IN A SOLEMN PROCESSION. CHAPS. XV. AND XVI.

1. Chap. xiii. compare 2 Sam. vi. 1—11, where verses 2—11 correspond almost word for word to vv. 6—14 of this chapter; but instead of vv. 1—5 with its elaborate account of the meeting in which it was resolved to fetch back the ark of the covenant, we find in Samuel merely a brief notice in v. 1 of an assembly of the armed forces of David.

Vv. 1—5. V. 1. *And David consulted* (cf. 2 Chr. x. 6; xxx. 2) *with the leaders of the thousands* (chap. xv. 25) *and the hundreds, with all the princes.* The preposition *lamed* is used before words which briefly describe the entire body of the persons referred to (cf. Gen. xxiii. 10). V. 2. *The whole congregation of Israel*, therefore, is the assembly of leaders and princes, *i.e.*, of the representatives of the congregation. In consequence of their resolution David afterwards convened the whole of the Israelites. V. 5. *If it seem good unto you;* a phrase frequently met with in the later historical books, Neh. ii. 5, 7; Esther i. 19; iii. 9. *And* (if it be) *from Jehovah our God* (Gen. xxiv. 50), if it has taken place at his instigation and with his consent. נפרצה before נשלחה is only met with here; the primary meaning of the former, *to break through*, is modified into that of *rapid execution, we will send quickly and without further consideration.* To

our brethren; the preposition עַל is chosen, because the *sending* involves the notion of commanding. After "*with them*" we must supply the words "*we will send.*" V. 4. *To do is thus,* in other words, thus must we do; the infinitive with *lamed* is used in this sense in chap. v. 1, and ix. 25; it is differently construed in Ex. viii. 22. V. 5. *From Shihor of Egypt;* according to other passages the southern boundary of Palestine was formed by *Nachal Mizraim,* the river of Egypt (vid. Josh. xv. 4, 47; Num. xxxiv. 5; 1 Kings viii. 65; 2 Kings xxiv. 7; 2 Chr. vii. 8; Is. xxvii. 12), or *Nahar Mizraim* (Gen. xv. 18), probably the brook which falls into the Mediterranean near the modern el-Arish, the ancient Ῥινοκόρουρα; cf. LXX. Is. xxvii. 12. As the expression in Joshua xiii. 3, "Shihor which is before Egypt," is merely another name for this brook, and does not refer to the Nile, and as there was also a small river on the borders of Asher, which bore the name of Shihor Libnath (Josh. xix. 26), we have no hesitation in deciding that *Shihor Mizraim* in the passage before us was also another name for the brook which formed the southern boundary of Palestine, and which is elsewhere designated the *Nachal* Mizraim. In Isaiah xxiii. 3, Jer. ii. 18, the Nile itself is called the *Shihor,* but in the historical books, and, with the exception of these two passages, in the prophetical books also it is called by the ordinary name יְאֹר.—On the preservation of the ark in *Kirjath-jearim,* see v. 6.—In what relation does vv. 1—5 stand to 2 Sam. vi. 1, "*then David gathered together again all the men of Israel who were capable of bearing arms, thirty thousand,*" which is rendered by the Septuagint καὶ συνήγαγεν ἔτι Δαυὶδ πάντα νεανίαν ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἑβδομήκοντα χιλιάδας? Before answering this question we must justify our rendering of the words. *Thenius* supposes them to mean: *and David increased again all the picked men to about* 30,000, in which case they would have nothing to do with the account of the ark of the covenant, but would merely contain a notice of the addition which David made to his army, and might be regarded as the conclusion of the history of the wars in 2 Sam. v. We see nothing, however, in these words at all resembling a conclusion; on the contrary, they form the commencement of a fresh section, which is linked to the foregoing portion of the narrative by the word *again.* Now וַיֹּסֶף may have the same meaning as וַיֹּאמֶר (cf. 1 Sam.

xv. 6; Ps. civ. 29), and this meaning is actually given to it here in the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and the Syriac versions. Moreover *Thenius* is obliged to alter the text in order to arrive at the explanation which he adopts (he inserts a lamed before Sheloshim). Lastly, the second verse presupposes some account of an assembly in the first. Hence the usual interpretation, which is confirmed by the Chronicles, must be retained, viz. *again, David assembled together all the chosen men*, &c. David assembled them *again, i.e.*, a second time. The first time, Israel gathered together around David in Hebron, 2 Sam. v. 1, 3; 1 Chr. xii. 23—40; and although the first assembly is not said to have been called together by David, a second assembly could be very properly described as *collected together again by him*, the chief point being the fact of their re-assembling, and the manner in which they were convened being a matter of but little moment. There is certainly something striking in the statement that he gathered together 30,000 men, for according to 1 Chr. xii. 23—40 and other passages, the men of Israel who were capable of bearing arms at the time of David were much more numerous than this. For 30,000 the Septuagint reads 700,000, and no number at all is given in the Chronicles. It might be conjectured that the occurrence of this number led the author of the Chronicles to explain the brief statement in 2 Sam. vi. 1 according to the narrative which follows, and to bring the notice of the holding of an assembly of thirty thousand men into harmony with the fact that all Israel took part in the removal of the ark of the covenant (2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Chr. xiii. 6, 8). In this case we must suppose that he referred the first statement to an assembly of distinguished warriors and princes, and regarded the second as denoting that the assembly of the whole people was called by them, and that this led him to distinguish the two assemblies, viz. the smaller or preparatory one, and the second or larger assembly of the whole people. Such an explanation as this might be given of the connection between the verses before us and 2 Sam. vi. 1, if there were any necessity for it. But the question suggests itself whether thirty thousand be the correct reading in the latter passage. When we keep clearly before our minds the account given by our historian, and remember that he also speaks of princes of the thousands, and that the number

30,000 does not occur anywhere else in the history of David, we are led to the conclusion that in all probability the original reading of the text of 2 Sam. vi. 1 was, "and David assembled together again all the chosen men of Israel, *the Sheloshim and the princes of the thousands.*" The mention of the Sheloshim, *i.e.*, of the most distinguished warriors and of the princes of the thousands, would necessarily imply that it was a preliminary assembly, and the connection between such an assembly and the general assembly of all the people could hardly be explained in any other way, than it is in the verses before us. In our commentary upon the verses themselves, we shall point out the peculiar phraseology contained in the latest historical books and particularly in the Books of Chronicles, which leads us to conclude that we have here an expansion of the brief accounts contained in 2 Sam. vi. 1.

Vv. 6—14.—V. 6. *And David went up and all Israel to Baalah* (another name for the town of Kirjath Jearim, Josh. xv. 9, which is also called Kirjath Baal, Josh. xviii. 14) away *to Kirjath Jearim, which belongs to Judah* (Judg. xviii. 12). From Josh. xx. 9 we should be led to expect הִיא rather than אֵל between Baalah and Kirjath Jearim; still אֵל is intelligible, as the clause *away to Kirjath Jearim* may be regarded as defining more precisely the expression, *to Baalah.* It would be still more easily accounted for, if we could take Baalah as the name of the district of Kirjath Jearim or of the hill upon which the town was situated (cf. Josh. xv. 11): *to (the district of) Baalah,* (or more exactly) *to Kirjath Jearim.* The ark of the covenant had remained in this place, at the house of Abinadab (1 Sam. vii. 1), since the time when it was delivered up by the Philistines, with the exception of a short period during which it was at Bethshemesh. אשר נקרא שֵׁם *who is called name* (cf. Lev. xxiv. 16, a passage which was evidently present to the minds of the Masoretes when they adopted this punctuation), but such a remark as this, that Jehovah is also called Shem (name), is evidently superfluous, at least in this connection, and as שָׁם שֵׁם is the reading of 2 Sam. vi. 2, שָׁם is clearly the proper reading here: who is worshipped *there* (viz., at the ark of the covenant).

2. CHAP. XIV. BUILDING OF DAVID'S HOUSE, &c.

Vv. 1, 2. cf. 2 Sam. v. 11, 12.—The readiness with which the king of the powerful and prosperous city of Tyre complied with the wishes of David, by sending messengers to open up communications, and placing skilful artizans at his service, was one of the most important of the fortunate circumstances connected with David's reign. It is not surprising, therefore, that immediately after the account of his alliance with Hiram, we should find the remark, *then David perceived, how Jehovah had appointed him king over Israel* (xxii. 10).—*His kingdom was lifted up on high.* נִשָּׂאת, according to the context, must be the third person feminine Niphal, an entirely exceptional form (in 2 Sam. xix. 43 the word occurs with the same pointing as an infinitive absolute Niphal), which, on account of the addition of the *Tav* of the feminine, has received the same pointing as is usually given to feminine participles, נְשָׂאת becoming first נִשָּׂאת and then נִשֵּׂאת. למעלה very frequently occurs in the Chronicles in connection with a verb which it renders more emphatic (*e.g.*, chap. xxii. 5, xxiii. 17, xxix. 3, 25; 2 Chr. i. 1, xvii. 12); hence we conclude that in this passage it is added by our historian himself. מלכותו for מַמְלַכְתּוֹ, the former is the form usually adopted by the later historians; in the present connection, and in chap. xvii. 11, 14, it has been substituted for the other or earlier form, which we find in 2 Sam. v. 12.

Vv. 3—7. cf. chap. iii. 5—8 and 2 Sam. v. 13—16.—In 2 Sam. iii. 5 concubines are mentioned before the *wives*. There is no reason to suppose that the former were intentionally omitted by the author of the Chronicles, for he refers to the concubines of David in chap. iii. 9.—*In Jerusalem;* this is the correct reading, which must originally have stood in Samuel also, for it is absolutely required there by the clause, *after he had come from Hebron*, which is wanting in the Chronicles, and the statement that the wives *sprang from Jerusalem* does not seem in any way suitable.—V. 4. The list of David's children had already been given at chap. iii. 5—8, but was inserted here again, because it stood in this connection in the original documents employed by our historian.

V. 8—12. cf. 2 Sam. v. 17—21.—*To seek David;* viz., for the purpose of destroying him, cf. 1 Sam. xxiii. 15, 25, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 2.—*He went out to meet them;* in the parallel passage in Samuel we have "*he went down into the fortress*" of Zion, chap. xi. 5. The expression *went down* might be explained on the supposition that David had hitherto continued in the mountains to the south of Zion, from which you look down upon Zion itself, and that the attack of the Philistines was first directed against this position, whereupon David withdrew to Zion; but it is more probable that the expression "to go down" is used in antithesis to the "going up" spoken of in *v.* 10, and merely denotes the act of retiring into a fortress. *Thenius* is of opinion that the use of this expression proves, that the attack referred to was some previous attack of the Philistines, which took place before the conquest of Jerusalem, and that the Mezudah (the fortress) was the cave of Adullam, but in this he completely sets aside the express statement of the verse before us, that David was king over all Israel, when the Philistines made this invasion. For the difficult words, *he went down to the fortress*, the historian has substituted the more general and very intelligible clause, "*he went up to meet them.*"—*In the valley of Rephaim*, vid. chap. xi. 15.—V. 10. *And wilt thou deliver them;* both here and at the end of the verse, where the same word occurs again, we have the perfect with *Vav* conseq., whereas in 2 Sam. v. the imperfect is used in both instances. It is impossible to determine which was the earliest reading; the perfect is very frequently met with in such a connection; *e.g.* in the similar sentence, 2 Kings xxi. 14. —V. 11. The battle was fought at Baal Perazim, and hence the words of our text, "*then* the Philistines *went up on the Baal-Perazim,*" refer to the same fact as those of Samuel, "*then David went to Baal-Perazim.*" The place mentioned, *Baal-Perazim*, is not otherwise known; at the same time it does not appear to have been a different place from the mountain of Perazim, Is. xxviii. 21.—*Peraz Maim, the breaking forth of water;* hence *Perazim* denotes the fissures made by the force of the water, and *Baal-Perazim* may have been the name of a mountain that had been seamed by torrents. According to the passage before us it owed its name to a historical event, namely, to a fierce conflict in which God broke through the enemy by the hand of

David like the *breaking through* of waters.—V. 12. The Philistines fled so quickly, that they left their *idols* upon the battle field, and the latter *were burnt at the command of David.* In 2 Sam. v. it is merely stated that *David and his men carried them away*, but the purpose for which they did so is not mentioned. The law commanded that idols should be burnt (Deut. vii. 5, 25). *Movers* regards the statement respecting the burning as a more precise account from a different source. By this victory David wiped away the reproach which had rested upon the nation from the days of Eli. As the Israelites were then deprived of their ark (1 Sam. iv. 11), so on the other hand did the gods of the Philistines now fall into their hands.

Vv. 13—17. cf. 2 Sam. v. 22—25.—V. 13. *In the valley*; according to 2 Sam. v. it was *the valley of Rephaim* (which is also the reading adopted here by the Septuagint and Syriac). There can be no doubt that this was the valley intended by our historian; *vid. v.* 16. *Movers* (p. 243) supposes that another valley is here referred to, namely, a valley near Gibeon, but *Thenius* has successfully replied to this in his note on 2 Sam. v. 22.—V. 14. "*Go not up after them;*" in 2 Sam. v. we find merely "*Go not up.*" This is a sufficient reply to the question, "Shall I attack them?" which we may supply here from *v.* 10; and if anything further were added we should expect it to be not after them, but *against* them, as an attack is expressly prohibited. The former reading has probably crept in from 2 Sam. v. 23, "fetch a compass behind them," and should therefore be either omitted, or altered into the other. The latter is the better plan of the two. *Turn away from them*; in 2 Sam. v. "*turn round so as to come upon their rear.*" As the latter reading is in harmony with the context, and in all respects suits the passage before us, we cannot but assume that it was the original reading of the text of the Chronicles also. From the *Baca-trees*; they must therefore have stood behind the Philistines. On the Baca-trees see *Winer* Realwörtertuch i. p. 128 (and *Kitto's* Cyclopædia i. p. 276). In the *Septuagint, Aquila*, and the *Vulgate*, the word is rendered ἄπιος, pyrus.—V. 15. הַצְּעָדָה (written in 2 Sam. v. without the article); according to the ordinary interpretation, *the sound of the going of God.* The feminine is only met with in this verse, and the parallel passage

in Samuel. There is no reason to question the correctness of the reading as it is found in both books. But it is not so evident that we are justified in supplying the genitive: "*of God.*" For it must be borne in mind that the sound of the going in the tops of the Baca-trees was merely to be the sign from which David could perceive that God would surely go before him. And this sign, according to the context in both accounts, may have been simply the rustling of the leaves of the Baca-trees, which is described in the Septuaguit as *τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ συσσεισμοῦ αὐτῶν.* The rustling of the leaves, so far as I can see, is called the sound of going on account of its resemblance to the sound produced by walking through fallen leaves (cf. Gen. iii. 8, the sound of God walking in the garden); and if we give this interpretation to the words: a a sound like that produced by walking, there will be no necessity to supply the genitive: "*of God.*" *Ewald* (Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 610) refers to the Arabic, and explains the word as meaning a dull sound as of one breathing with difficulty (cf. דְּמָמָה which occurs in 1 Kings xix. 12 and Job iv. 16, as a sign of the self-revealing Deity.) But why then is it so expressly stated that this sound was to be heard in the tops of the Baca-trees?—V. 16. *And David* (and his people) *smite;* in 2 Sam. v. we find the singular. The engagement was so decisive that the Philistines were compelled to retreat from the whole line of which they had taken possession. This line stretched from *Gibeon* to *Gezer.* *Gibeon,* undoubtedly the present el-Jib, was about six miles from Jerusalem in a north-westerly direction, cf. chap. viii. 29. The situation of Gezer may now be determined with tolerable precision (cf. Judg. i. 29); it must have stood very near to the spot on which it is placed upon the map by *v. Raumer* and *Stülpnagel,* about five miles from Gibeon in a north-westerly direction. But it is *a priori* improbable, that the Philistines, who were attacking David and his army, the base of whose operations was Jerusalem, occupied this line from Gibeon to Gezer. Moreover, it would be difficult to reconcile with such a position the statement contained in 2 Sam. v. 22 that they had spread themselves out in the valley of Rephaim. Now, in 2 Sam. v. 25, instead of Gibeon, we find the very similar name Geba; and if we suppose this Geba to have been the same as

Gibea in the province of Judah (Josh. xv. 57), which we can have no difficulty in recognising in the modern village of Yefa on a conical hill about nine or ten miles to the south-west of Jerusalem (*Robinson* ii. p. 580, 593), we should then have a line given here, which passed near the western slope of the mountains of Judah, and terminated towards the south in Geba or Gibea, a prominent city which could be seen from a great distance, and towards the north in Gezer, a place that was certainly situated upon a very rocky projection of the long hill towards the west, which contains distinct traces of fortifications (*Robinson* iii. p. 211, 272). Now this line suits the context in every respect. From it the Philistines could very easily overspread the valley of Rephaim, and it would form a good point of support for the attacks upon Judah, being intersected by the roads which led from Judah to the cities of the Philistines. To recover possession of this line was equivalent to setting free the whole of the mountains of Judah as far as their most westerly slope, and it is very apparent that our author intended to show that such a deliverance was really effected by the decisive battle here described. We cannot possibly see what obstacle there is to our fixing upon this Gibea in the province of Judah as the place referred to (*Ewald* Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 610), for Gibea or Geba, in the tribe of Benjamin, would not answer to the description contained in the verses before us much better than Gibeon.—V. 17. This verse, which indicates the result of the events just described, is not found in Samuel. We agree with *Movers* (p. 196) that it was appended by the historian himself, as an appropriate conclusion to the parenthetical notices with which he had interrupted his account of the ark of the covenant, for the passage reminds us in several respects of other similar passages in the Books of Chronicles.

3. Chap. xv. and xvi. The thread of the story, which was broken off at chap. xiii. 14, is here resumed. It appears as if the events narrated in chap. xiv. filled up the three months, during which the ark of the covenant remained in the house of Obed Edom; at all events this interval afforded an opportunity for introducing supplementary notices of certain matters connected with the history of David. The commencement of the account of the ark of the covenant in chap. xiii. corresponds in

almost every respect to 2 Sam. vi. 1—11; but the continuation in the chapters before us contains much more elaborate details than the corresponding section in 2 Sam. vi. 11—19, which we find almost word for word in chap. xvi. 25 to xvii. 3. But both before and after this section, viz. in chap. xvi. 1—24, and xvii. 4—43, the Book of Chronicles contains a variety of particulars, to which we find no reference in the Books of Samuel.

V. 1. Among the buildings completed by David was a tent for the ark of God, the construction of which is narrated in the verse before us. This tent is only casually referred to in 2 Sam. vi. 17. *He built himself houses* (besides the house which he had erected with the assistance of Hiram, chap. xiv. 1) *in the city of David*, chap. xi. 5; he also set up a new *tent for the ark of the covenant*. The old tent (tabernacle) was left in Gibeon (chap. xvi. 39, xxi. 29; 1 Kings iii. 4 seq., ix. 2), but our historical books furnish no explanation of the reason why the ancient holy tabernacle was not removed from Gibeon to Jerusalem.

Vv. 2—24. The assembled Israelites proceeded from Jerusalem to the place where the ark of the covenant then was. The preparations for the solemn procession, which was to accompany the ark to Jerusalem, are fully described. V. 2. The word *then* refers to the time already mentioned in chap. xiii. 14, viz. at the end of the three months. The fact that the ark was carried is briefly recorded in 2 Sam. vi. 13, but in the passage before us it is emphatically stated that it was the vocation of the Levites to carry it (Num. i. 50, iv. 15, vii. 9, x. 17), and this declaration contains an express acknowledgment that it was illegal to place it on a cart (chap. xiii. 7).—V. 3. The attendance of all Israel to take part in the procession is noticed in Samuel also, but it is only here that we read that David had "gathered all Israel together to Jerusalem" for that purpose (cf. chap. xiii. 5, and xxviii. 1.)—V. 4. The heads of the tribe of the Levites (v. 12) together with their brethren were set apart from the rest of the assembled Israelites as a sacred band. *The sons of Aaron* were the priests named in *v.* 11; *the Levites* were the six princes with their brethren, vv. 5—10.—V. 5. *Of the sons of Kohath, Uriel* (chap. vi. 9) *the prince* with 120 of his family; he is mentioned first because the Kohathites were specially entrusted with the charge of the sanctuary (Num. vii. 9).—V. 8. *Elizaphan* was a descend-

ant of Kohath; see Ex. vi. 22, where his name is spelt Elzaphan. The prince of the fathers' house (v. 12) of Elizaphan was *Shemaiah*, whose name occurs again in chap. xxiv. 6.—V. 9. *Hebron* a son of Kohath, Ex. vi. 18; 1 Ch. v. 28.—V. 10. *Uzziel* (according to chap. v. 28; Ex. vi. 18, likewise a son of Kohath) was the father of Elzaphan and other sons (Ex. vi. 22). The latter must therefore have formed a father's house of their own, by the side of that of Elzaphan, and given it the name of Uzziel, cf. 1 Ch. xxiii. 20, xxiv. 24. Hence of the six fathers' houses, referred to here, four descended from Kohath, and one each from Merari and Gershom.—V. 11. *Zadok* (who came to Hebron to join David, chap. xii. 28) of the family of Eleazar, and *Abiathar* of that of Ithamar, were the princes of the two priestly lines, and were colleagues in office (chap. xxiv. 3—6; cf. 2 Sam. xv. 24 sqq. xx. 25). They were summoned by David together with the six princes already named, and—v. 12, these, *the heads of the fathers' houses* (chap. viii. 6, 10) were instructed to prepare themselves and their brethren for the sacred duties, which they would have to perform in connexion with the removal of the ark of the covenant. *To sanctify themselves, i.e.*, to put away everything unclean, and to avoid coming into contact with anything unclean (Gen. xxxv. 2), for example, putting on unclean clothes (Ex. xix. 10, 15; cf. 2 Ch. xxx. 3.) *Unto that which I have prepared for it;* that is, unto the spot where, according to v. 3, I have prepared a place for it. The omission of the pronoun אשר gives to the relative clause the character of a substantive notion, and this renders it capable of government by a preposition. We find the same construction in 2 Chr. i. 4, and similar ones in 1 Chr. xxix. 3, 2 Chr. xvi. 9, xxx. 18 seq., and Nehem. viii. 10, cf. *Ewald* Lehrbuch 323 b.—V. 13. למבראשונה a compound word; the interrogative *mah* is here connected with a long word, in the same manner as we frequently find it combined with a shorter one, *e.g.* מַדּוּעַ Ex. iv. 2, מַלֹּכֶם Is. iii. 15, cf. מתלאה for מה־תלאה Mal. i. 13. The preposition *lamed* before *mah*, as in לָמָּה *wherefore*, can only appear in the abbreviated form לָ when prefixed to so long a word. The question is this: *why were ye not there at the beginning (i.e.* when the ark was taken away from the house of Abinadab, chap. xiii.)? By

כִּי this interrogative clause is made into a conditional protasis; "*for why were ye not there*" &c. means because ye were not there in the beginning, did not God break in upon us with violence? *For we have not sought him*, we have not approached *in the proper way i.e.* according to the law, which required that the sanctuary upon which he was enthroned should be carried by the Levites (Num. vii. 9) and that nothing unclean or unholy should come near to it. דרשׁ to approach is used here in its primary sense, from which that of asking was a derivative (1 Chr. x. 14). —Vv. 14, 15. The Levites came at the summons of David, purified themselves, and, as the historian here relates, in anticipation of the course of events, carried the ark of the covenant. *On their shoulders*, Num. vii. 9.—Vv. 16—24. The princes of the Levites receive instructions to train the musicians and singers, who were subordinate to them, for the solemn procession. They comply with these instructions.—V. 16. The כְּלֵי שִׁיר (Nehem. xii. 36) are the various instruments mentioned here, especially the *nebalim* and *chinneroth*, as we may clearly see from v. 19, and 2 Ch. v. 13. As the Hiphil השׁמיע has the meaning *to sound* or *cause to clang*, the participle here used may be referred to the musical instruments, *sounding so as to raise a noise, i.e.* so that the singing and music were very loud. In other passages we find the expression to *lift up the voice*; in 2 Chr. v. 13 it refers to the loud blast of trumpets, in Ezra iii. 12 to a loud and joyful shout; and the passage before us *(with the voice)* has a similar meaning to 2 Chr. v. 13. The verb הרים occurs in other passages with the accusative and with *beth*, cf. Ex. xiv. 16, and vii. 20. *For joy*, as a sign of joy, and a means of increasing it, v. 25; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18, xxix. 30.—V. 18. And with them their brethren of *the second rank*; הַמִּשְׁנֶה in the singular occurs also in 2 Kings xxiii. 4; we more frequently find מִשְׁנֶה used to denote the second in a series (1 Sam. vii. 2, xvii. 13; 2 Sam. iii. 3) or in office (1 Chr. xvi. 5. cf. Esther x. 3). The word *Ben*, after Zechariah, has found its way into the text through a copyist's error, as the *Vav* before the following name, and vv. 20 and 25 clearly show. *Jaaziel* is called Aziel in v. 20, and Jeiel in chap. xvi. 5. There are thirteen names in all. The last two Obed-edom and Jeiel (or Jehiah as he is called

in *v.* 24) are described as doorkeepers; but according to *v.* 20 they were employed as musicians.—V. 19—21. The singers mentioned in *v.* 17 seq. were divided into three companies, according to the different instruments on which they played. (1) *v.* 19. *Heman*, *Asaph*, and *Ethan* played *with cymbals* (the word used here only occurs in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, but in these we find it very frequently) *of brass*, cf. *Josephus*, Arch. vii. 12, 3, *κύμβαλά τε ἦν πλατέα καὶ μεγάλα χάλκεα.* נחשת may be connected with the previous word as an accusative defining it more precisely, since it describes the material of which the instruments were made.—(2) *v.* 20. Zechariah and seven others play בנבלים על עלמות; we are not in a position to explain these words, as our acquaintance with the music of the ancient Israelites does not furnish the least clue to the meaning of the musical terms, which we meet with both in the superscriptions to the Psalms, and also in the body of them in Habakkuk iii., and here and there in the Books of Chronicles. Modern investigations into the music of the ancient Greeks appear to confirm the opinion that the words *Alamoth* and *Hassheminith*, which occur in the superscriptions, and *Al-taschith* (Ps. lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv.), *al Aijeleth hasshachar* (Ps. xxii.) and others which belong to the same category, are names for different tunes. In most of the expressions we can recognise the opening words of songs; the words *Sheminith* (Ps. vi. xii.), and *Gittith* (Ps. viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv.) alone appear to be borrowed from instruments. The word *Alamoth* both here and Ps. xlvi. is pointed by the Masoretes as the plural of Almah *a virgin*. But as we fancy that the same word occurs in the combination *Al muth labben* in the heading of Ps. ix. (the preposition על being probably omitted to avoid the repetition of the same sound *al*) another explanation of the word suggests itself to our mind. At any rate the word עַלְמוּת the abstract in וּת from עלם in combination with לַבֵּן would give the meaning: *Youth is to the son*, which might very appropriately form the commencement of a song. We shall not offer any further arguments in support of our interpretation of this word, since this could only be done in a treatise embracing all the musical terms that occur in the Old Testament.—(3) *v.* 21. The six here named played *upon lyres after the Sheminith to lead*, probably to

lead the singing by way of accompaniment. What the Sheminith originally signified we cannot tell, for the word, which means *the eighth*, may relate to very different things. It might denote, for example, the eighth in the series of tunes, or an instrument with eight strings, from which the tune received its name, and in this case there would be nothing to hinder the conclusion that the tune was played upon viols which, according to *Josephus* (Antiquities vii. 12, 3), were ten-stringed instruments played with the bow. The Piel נִצֵּחַ means *to lead* according to the evident usage of the language, and this meaning is confirmed by the Aramaean. Of the six names given here only five occur in *v.* 18. The last name in the series is here mentioned first, whether it was omitted from *v.* 18 by mistake, or was inserted in the text in this verse through an oversight, we cannot tell. The three classes of singers had thus three different instruments to play, cymbals, nablia, and lyres (citharae.) The first served to produce a loud *clang*, the last *led*. No tune is mentioned in the case of the first, probably because their clear tones were only introduced at intervals, the other two were played to certain tunes.

Vv. 22—24. The historian avails himself of the opportunity to give the names of other Levites and priests who took part in the solemn procession. V. 22. *Chenaniah* (*v.* 27, chap. xxvi. 29) *the prince of the Levites* was not one of the six princes (vv. 5—10). They were princes of the Levitical families, but according to this verse Chenaniah was properly a prince on account of his office, which required peculiar learning; he was therefore necessarily appointed without regard to his family and birth. He was בַּמַּשָּׂא and, as is afterwards added by way of explanation, יסר במשא; the inf. abs. Kal יָסֹר, which only occurs here, means *to admonish*, according to the use of the Kal in Prov. ix, 7; Ps. xciv. 10; Hos. x. 10, but as it is a skilful man who is here entrusted with this duty, most commentators have felt no hesitation in taking the word admonish in the sense of *teach, instruct* (*e.g. J. H. Michaelis, Gesenius thes.* p. 918). In that case the infinitive absolute in the explanatory clause takes the place of a finite tense: *he gives instruction in anything.* Others regard the word as an imperfect of the root שָׂרַר = סָרַר, *he was*

a prince. בַּמַּשָּׂא (this is the proper punctuation) in most editions is written the first time with, the second time without the article; *R. Norzi*, however, expressly states that the proper punctuation in both instances is with the article. The *Septuagint* renders it ἄρχων τῶν ᾠδῶν; *Luther* translates it *der Sangmeister* (the singing-master), and the majority of commentators adopt this rendering, but others follow the *Vulgate (prophetiæ præerat ad præcinendam melodiam)*, and, taking the word to be a term associated with prophecy, make Chenaniah a leader or prince of *prophecy*. Others again suppose him to have been a president and leader of the Levites appointed to carry the sacred things, and appeal to the use of the word in 2 Chr. xxxv. 3; Num. iv. 19, 27, 31, 32, 47 *(e.g., Junius, Tremellius)*. The following then are the interpretations given of this verse: *the prince of the Levites over the singing* (the prophecy, or the carrying), *he gave instruction in singing* (prophesying, or carrying), or he *was superintendent of the singing* (prophesying, or carrying). It is hard to say which of these is to be preferred, for the Old Testament furnishes but few data for the explanation of this brief passage. But from the few we possess, we conclude, for the following reasons, that the word means *to carry*,—(1) As the whole section treats of the transport of the ark, those passages are peculiarly in point in which the word is used to denote the carrying of the ark, or of the sacred things in general. Now, according to 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, after the building of the temple there was no *Massah* (burden) upon the shoulders of the Levites, *i.e.*, when once the Israelites possessed a temple in the place of the moveable sanctuary, they no longer required to make provision for the carrying of the sacred things. The same word is also applied in Num. iv. 19 sqq. to the carriage of the holy things. (2.) It would be very strange if Chenaniah were described as the leader of the sacred singing (as he is in the *Septuagint* version), seeing that Heman, Asaph, and Ethan are spoken of as the leaders of the singing and the music, not only in the chapter before us but in many passages besides, and Chenaniah is never mentioned in connection with them. It is evident that the only reason why the LXX. referred the word in this instance to the lifting up of the voice in singing was, that music had formed the subject of the previous verses,

and that *the singers* are afterwards mentioned (in *v.* 27) along with *Hammassa.* (3.) Chenaniah is described in chap. xxvi. 29 as the superintendent of *the* Levites, who had to attend to *outward affairs,* and were employed *as overseers and judges.* Now the Levites, who were scribes and overseers (2 Chr. xxxiv. 13; 1 Chr. xxiv. 5), were distinct from the singers, and hence, supposing the Chenaniah there spoken of to be the same man, we cannot possibly imagine him to have been a leader of the singers. But it is a very conceivable thing that when the sanctuary had been placed in a permanent building, the overseers and judges might be selected from among *the* Levites, who had previously been appointed to carry the holy things (cf. 2 Chr. xxxv. 3 sqq.). We should then take יסר as the imperfect of סר = שׂר. But we are hardly justified in giving to the Kal the meaning to teach, or instruct; and should not expect to find the infinitive absolute in this passage. Hence, even without any further reference to the connection, we feel perfectly warranted in giving the preference to this explanation, which is clearly admissible, especially when we consider the frequent interchange of *samech* and *sin.* Moreover, not a few MSS. and one edition of the Bible have the reading יָשׂר or יָשׂוֹר.—*For he was clever,* and well-fitted on account of his knowledge for the discharge of the duties of his office. מְבִין generally denotes a knowledge of music (chap. xxv. 7; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12), but it is also used in a different sense when applied to Levites in 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, and to other men of skill in 1 Chr. xxvi. 5. The rendering which we propose is this: *and Chenaniah, the prince of the Levites over the burden* (the preposition *beth* may be easily explained from the notion of ruling or leading contained in the substantive *Sar*) *he led the burden, for he was skilled,* sc. in the customs which it was necessary to observe in the carriage of the holy things.—V. 23. *Berechiah and Elkanah were doorkeepers of the ark,* as well as Obed-edom and Jeiel (vv. 18, 24); they probably went immediately before the ark with their attendants, whilst the latter with their attendants brought up the rear.—V. 24. *Nethaneel* apparently the father of Shemaiah; chap. xxiv. 6.—*Benaiah* vid. chap. xvi. 6.—The order of the procession was as follows: (1), the singers in three companies, vv. 19—21; (2), Chenaniah the

prince of the Levites, v. 22; (3), two doorkeepers (with their attendants), v. 23; (4), the priests with trumpets immediately before the ark; lastly (5), two doorkeepers (with their attendants), v. 24.

V. 25 to chap. xvi. 3 (cf. 2 Sam. vi. 12—19).—V. 25. The corresponding words in 2 Sam. vi. 12 are these: *then David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom into the city of David with gladness.* Instead of David alone, the elders of Israel and the princes of the thousands are mentioned here in accordance with v. 3 and chap. xiii. 1; and instead of the *ark of God* it is called the *ark of the covenant of Jehovah* as in vv. 26, 28, 29. The narrative, which proceeds without interruption in Samuel, is here continued after the long parenthesis, and the connection is loosely established by the word וידוד; thus also for the clause "and he went . . . with joy," there was necessarily substituted the longer clause, "*it was David and the elders of Israel . . . who went . . . with gladness.*" —V. 26. The account given in this verse differs from that contained in 2 Sam. vi. According to the verse before us, the sacrifices were offered because God helped the Levites, who carried the ark of the covenant, *i.e.*, because God had permitted them to continue near his sanctuary, and even to carry it upon their shoulders, without their suffering the same fate as Uzza (chap. xiii. 10); and the meaning evidently is, that immediately after the ark had been lifted up "*they offered seven oxen and seven rams.*" But, according to 2 Sam. vi., after the ark had moved six paces forward, David offered an ox and a fatling, for there is no reason to interpret the words as meaning that an ox and a fattened calf were sacrificed every six paces (the Septuagint clearly reads seven), although this is the explanation which most commentators give to the passage. The difference between the two accounts is therefore not very great, and both of them may be founded upon the same original record, as they both treat of sacrifices, which were offered immediately after the lifting of the ark or after it had moved seven paces forwards, and the number seven occurs in the Book of Chronicles as the number of animals sacrificed.

(*Keil* does not adopt the same method of reconciling the two accounts. He says: "the two passages relate to different sacri-

fices, as *Grotius*, *Clericus*, and others have already observed. According to 2 Sam. vi. 13 an ox and a fatted sheep were offered during the procession, when the bearers of the ark had moved six paces forward; on the other hand, according to 1 Chr. xv. 26, the Levites offered seven bullocks and seven rams after the ark had been safely brought to the place intended for it, that is, after the procession was over, as it is expressly stated that 'God had *helped* the Levites who bore the ark.' Hence the two accounts do not exclude each other, but are supplementary the one to the other. We need not be amazed at the great number of animals slain, for, according to 2 Sam. vi. 19, a feast was given from these sacrifices to the whole of the people, who had assembled in great crowds. Nor can any objection to 2 Sam. vi. 13 be founded upon the fact that the procession would have been interrupted too much by the offering of sacrifices every six paces, for it is not said that the bearers always stood still while the sacrifices were offered. And it is most probable that priests were stationed at regular intervals throughout the entire distance who offered sacrifices when the ark passed by, without interfering with the advance of the procession itself.")

V. 27. מְעִיל the upper garment worn by the higher classes over the *Cuttoneth* (2 Sam. xiii. 18)—דְּשֵׁר הַמַּשָּׂא הַמְשֹׁרְרִים has been supposed to mean *the prince* (and supplying a second שַׂר) *namely the prince of the Massa and the singers*, so that *vav* would have to be supplied before the last word, or שַׂר supplied a second time with the meaning: *namely the prince of the singers*. But it is evident that such additions to the text are inadmissible. We conjecture rather that there is an error in the text, although the translators of the earliest versions had the text before them in its present form, for the *Septuagint* reads, *ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ᾠδῶν τῶν ᾀδόντων*, the *Vulgate*, *princeps prophetiae inter cantores*, and the *Syriac* alone contains no trace of these words. In 2 Sam. vi. instead of the clause from "*and David*" to "*the Massa* (with) *the singers*" we find the words *and David danced with all his might before Jehovah*, and a copyist remembering the reference already made in the verse to David's dress might easily write מכרבל for מכרכר, and from the illegibility of the original set down במעיל בכל עז for ברץ as a conjectural reading. The fact that the bearers of the ark, the singers and Chenaniah are mentioned

along with David may easily be explained from the previous verses. But *hammassa* has most probably crept into the text from v. 22, and "*the singers*" through an unintentional repetition. At any rate the text is not of such a nature that the juxtaposition of *hammassa* and "*the singers*" can warrant us in inferring that the obscure word *hammassa* was used to denote "*the singers.*" The concluding words "*and David wore a linen shoulder-garment*" (the dress of the priests, 1 Sam. xxii. 18) occur in almost exactly the same form in 2 Sam. vi. Earlier expositors have assumed, as the simplest explanation of the verse before us, that David wore a linen shoulder-garment (a cape or shawl) over the dress of byssus. *Movers* is of opinion that the historian had two accounts before him, the one of which represented David as accompanying the procession clothed in a dress of byssus, while the other merely mentioned the shoulder-garment of linen, and that he adopted both accounts. We cannot subscribe to such opinions, since the Hebrew of the words "clothed with a robe of byssus" so closely resembles that of the expression "danced with all his might" (2 Sam. vi.), as to indicate not different accounts, but the same original text. V. 28. Given with greater brevity in 2 Sam. vi. 15. The fuller details in the verse before us refer back to vv. 19—21. *With cymbals sounding loudly*; the words are separated by the accents, but according to v. 19 and chap. xvi. 5, they are evidently connected together. V. 29. Instead of *dancing and playing*, the reading in Samuel is leaping and dancing. It is worthy of notice that the historian in mentioning Michal, evidently refers to the account contained in 2 Sam. vi. 20—23, though he omits the incident there narrated (see chap. xvi. 43).—Chap. xvi. 1 (cf. xv. 1). The points in which this verse and the following differ from 2 Sam. vi. 17—18 are very unimportant.—אשפר does not occur anywhere else except in 2 Sam. vi. It is not easy to determine with certainty the meaning of the word (cf. *Thenius*); the *Vulgate* renders the passage *et partem assae carnis bubalae*, and the Rabbins also understand the word as meaning *a portion of meat.*

After the word אשישה there follows a further description of the festivities and of the order of worship to be performed at the temple in Jerusalem. This description extends from v. 4 to 43. It is only found in the Book of Chronicles, and looks like a long

parenthesis when compared with the text of the Book of Samuel, for it separates the word *Ashisha* (rendered *flagon* in the English version, *a cake* by Gesenius—Tr.) from the clause which immediately follows it in 2 Sam. vi. 19: "*so all the people departed every one to his house, and David returned to bless his household,*" and we find this clause with but little variation in verse 43 at the close of the narrative.

Chap. xvi. 4—36. Vv. 4—6. When the ark of the covenant had been placed in its tent, the Levites entered upon their duties before the ark, according to David's instructions.—V. 4. לְהַזְכִּיר; compare the superscription to the two psalms xxxviii. and lxx., where the same word occurs. V. 5. *Jeiel* is called *Jaaziel* in chap. xv. 18, and *Aziel* in chap. xv. 20. The form in which it is written here may probably be explained, by supposing that the eye of the copyist wandered to the name *Jehiel*, which occurs immediately afterwards. In chap. xv. 19—21 we have a list of the men who accompanied the ark to Jerusalem, but in the verses before us we have merely the names of those who were appointed to serve before the ark. There is nothing surprising, therefore, in the fact that only a portion of those previously named are mentioned here.—V. 6. *Benaiah* was one of the priests spoken of in chap. xv. 24, but *Jahaziel* is not noticed there.—Vv. 7—36. By David's directions Asaph and his brethren joined in singing a psalm of praise, which is given here.—V. 7. *On that day David committed first to Asaph and his brethren to thank Jehovah.* The words נתן ביד are separated from each other by several intervening words, but they must be taken together and explained in the usual way, viz., *to commit to* any one, since the express intention of v. 4 is to lay stress upon the fact, that Asaph entered for the first time upon the duties assigned him on the very day, on which the ark was brought to Jerusalem.—*First;* because the order of worship appointed by David was then observed for the first time. —The psalm contained in vv. 8—36 consists of Ps. cv. 1—15, xcvi., cvii. 1, and cvi. 47, 48. On the relation of the psalm before us to the corresponding passages in the Book of Psalms, we shall be better able to speak after noticing the points in which they differ.—Verses 8—11 are found in Ps. cv. 1—4 in precisely the same form as here.—V. 12. פִּידֵהוּ for פִּיהוּ Ps. cv. 5.—V. 13. *The seed of Israel;* Ps. cv. 6, *the seed of Abraham.* The read-

ing in the Chronicles is the better of the two on account of the parallelism.—V. 15. *Be ye mindful;* Ps. cv. 8, *he hath remembered,* the latter is preferable because of the perfect which follows "*he hath commanded.*"—ליצחק; the softer form occurs in Ps. cv. 9 לישחק, which we also meet with in Jerem. xxxiii. 26 and Amos vii. 9.—V. 18. ארץ; Ps. cv. 11, את־ארץ.—V. 19. *when ye were;* Ps. cv. 12, *when they were.* The third person suffix may easily have been altered into the second on account of the occurrence of the second in v. 18.—V. 20. *And from one kingdom;* the *vav* is omitted in Ps. cv.—V. 21. For איש we find אדם in Ps. cv.—V. 22. *Do my prophets no harm;* in Ps. cv. we have *lamed* instead of *beth.*—V. 23. The two clauses of this verse are found in Ps. xcvi. 1, 2, with two others which are not given here. *From day to day;* the psalm has *lamed* instead of *el.*—V. 24. את־כבודו; without את in Ps. xcvi. 3.—V. 25. *He also is to be feared;* the *vav* is omitted in the psalm.—V. 27. *Strength and gladness are in his place;* Ps. xcvi. 6, "*strength and beauty are in his sanctuary.*" The word חדוה (gladness) which is very common in Aramaean, only occurs twice in the Old Testament, here and Nehem. viii. 10.—V. 29. "*come before him;*" Ps. xcvi. 8, "*come into his courts.*" The three clauses in this verse are very remarkable, as we find but two any where else. In Ps. xcvi. 9, the two clauses 29 *(c)* and 30 *(a)* form one verse. The symmetry of the verses has been destroyed by the omission of the first clause of Ps. xcvi. 10, after verse 31 (*a*). In consequence of this omission there were only five clauses left, and these have been arranged in two verses. The missing clause is afterwards given in v. 31 *(b).*—V. 30. In Ps. xcvi. 10, the words "*that it be not moved*" are followed by the clause "*he shall judge the people righteously;*" a clause taken from Ps. ix. 9 and xcviii. 9.—V. 31 (*b*) we find in Ps. xcvi. 10 (*a*). The introduction of this clause occasions another change in the division of the verses, and a separation of the coordinate members.—V. 32. והשדה; Ps. xcvi. 12, שָׂדַי the old form of the word which gained currency again in a later age.—V. 33. *The trees of the wood,* Ps. xcvi. *all the trees of the wood. Before the Lord;* the *mem* is omitted in the psalm. The second clause corresponds to the first of Ps. xcvi. 13; the conclusion of the psalm (xcvi. 13 *b)*

is omitted here.—V. 34 occurs in Ps. cvi. 1 and cvii. 1.—V. 35—36 we find with very few variations in Ps. cvi. 47, 48, where v. 36 forms the doxology at the close of the fourth book of the Psalms; but it is worthy of notice that instead of "*let all the people say Amen; praise ye Jehovah,*" which we find in Ps. cvi. 48, the words as they stand here are, "*and all the people said Amen, and praised Jehovah.*" In this case they form part of the narrative and describe the manner in which the liturgical ceremony terminated: *then* (at the conclusion of the singing) *all the people said Amen and praised Jehovah.* The infinitive הַלֵּל is to be regarded as a continuation of the previous imperative with *vav conseq.*

We have thus collected together the points in which our text differs from the Psalms, for the purpose of obtaining the means of replying to the question, what is the connection between the psalm before us and the corresponding passages in the Book of Psalms, and between the text of the former and that of the latter?

The first thing which attracts our attention is the manner in which the different sections of the psalm given here are found scattered about in the Book of Psalms.—Vv. 8—22 form the commencement of Ps. cv.; and this psalm is so constructed that verses 10—15, relating to the history of Abraham, naturally require, as a continuation, the history of Jacob and of the Israelites in Egypt to the time of Moses, which is given in v. 16 sqq. The construction of the psalm is as follows: Israel is called upon to praise God and remember the wonderful works of God (vv. 1—7), who has always been mindful of the covenant which he made with Abraham (vv. 8, 9). The historical proof, that he has been mindful of this covenant, is given in v. 10 and the following verses in a continuous and harmonious description of the incidents connected with the early history of the nation. Thus v. 16 is closely connected with v. 15, and it is at once apparent that v. 15 is not the conclusion of the psalm. Hence the psalm, as we have it here, merely gives us in vv. 16—22 the commencement of the historical proof, and then suddenly passes to the words in praise of Jehovah, which we find in Ps. xcvi. This psalm is quoted entire in vv. 23—33, with the exception of the variations noticed above. The powerful and spirited commencement of Ps. xcvi.

1, 2, is softened down by the omission of two clauses, as it no longer forms the commencement here; and the last clause of the 13th verse, which forms so fitting a conclusion to Ps. xcvi., is also omitted here, as the psalm does not end at v. 33. Finally, there are appended a few more verses, containing a fresh exhortation to thank God and seek his aid. Of these, vv. 35, 36 occur at the end of a psalm (cvi.), and this psalm commences with v. 34. The historical notice, which is placed in the Chronicles at the conclusion of the psalm, we find in Ps. cvi. 48; but, as we have already observed, instead of "and the people said," the reading there is "let the people say."—*Hitzig* (Psalmen 2, p. 159 sqq.) endeavours to prove that the psalm before us is to be regarded as the original not only of Ps. cv., but also of Ps. xcvi., and that Ps. cxvi. 1, 47, 48, were taken from this psalm. But although the relation of v. 36 to Ps. cvi. 48 appears to favour this view, we cannot regard it as the correct one. For it appears to us indisputable that the commencement of the historical proof of the proposition, that God was mindful of his covenant, which we have in vv. 16—22, was originally intended to be carried out in the manner, in which we actually find it continued in Ps. cv. 16—45. And if verses 8—22 are evidently merely a portion of a longer psalm, detached from the rest, we are forced to the conclusion that the whole psalm is a collection of such portions of existing psalms, which were here combined together for a particular purpose. Hence, at the very outset, the supposition that we have here a psalm, composed of extracts from psalms which were well known to the Israelites, appears to us more probable than the opinion, that "the author of the Chronicles, with great care, and having recourse to foreign aid, produced a psalm, adapted for an age that was long gone by" (*Hitzig* p. 160). And with regard to the relation between v. 36 and Ps. cvi. 48, we must bear in mind that the fourth book of psalms ends with Ps. cvi., and that v. 48, which no doubt originally formed part of the psalm itself, is also the doxology with which the fourth book concludes; and if in Ps. lxxii. the author of the doxology utters the Amen himself, whereas in Ps. cvi. 48 the people are exhorted to say Amen, this may arise from the fact that the latter psalm originally concluded with the injunction to say Amen. But, in our account of the festival, it was necessary

to relate that the people obeyed this injunction on the occasion referred to, and therefore the words "let them praise" were altered into "and they praised."

If now we examine into the relation, in which the text of the Chronicles stands to that of the corresponding passages in the psalms, we must state at the outset that the points, in which the one text differs from the other, are nowhere of any great importance, and that they are not such as to justify us in affirming, that we have the original in one case and a mere imitation in the other. We do not dispute that in the passages cited by *Hitzig* (p. 159) the text of the Chronicles contains almost always the earlier and original reading. But there are other passages, in which the reading of the Psalms is undoubtedly to be preferred; *e.g.*, in Ps. cv. 8 זכר is the correct reading, for God was to be praised for having remembered the promises, which were given when the covenant was concluded, and the word, which he established for future generations, *i.e.*, his own promise. Moreover, הדוה (1 Chr. xvi. 27) is a more rare, but certainly not an older word than תפארת in the psalm. Again, as the text of the Psalms was in particular use for liturgical purposes, it was more exposed to alterations on account of changes in the language than the text of a historical book, and for that reason the occurrence of more antiquated phrases and expressions in the Chronicles would not of itself constitute a proof, that the Chronicles contained the original reading and the Psalms were an imitation.

Vv. 37—43. The narrative now goes back to v. 4 sqq., and continues the list of the Levites appointed to serve before the ark, of which we had only the commencement there.—V. 37. *Asaph and his brethren;* we have here the prep. *lamed* before the accusative of the object. *According to the day's duties each on its own day; i.e.*, to perform every day the service that was prescribed for it, cf. 2 Chr. viii. 14, xxxi. 16; Ex. v. 13, 19, xvi. 4.—V. 38. *And their brethren*; the plural suffix shows that some name has been omitted after *Obed-edom.* From the concluding part of the verse it is evident that *Chosah* should be inserted: "*and Obed-edom and Chosah* (chap. xxvi. 10) *and their brethren are sixty-eight; and* (David appointed) *Obed-edom, Ben-Jeduthun and Chosah as doorkeepers;* a larger number of doorkeepers are named in the more complete list given in chap. xxvi.

—Vv. 39, 40. Whilst the ark was kept in the tent that David had prepared for it in Jerusalem, and singers and doorkeepers were appointed to serve there, *Zadok the high priest* and the priests under him continued to discharge the duties of their office before the holy tabernacle, the ancient dwelling place of Jehovah which stood upon the high place at Gibeon, that they might offer upon the altar of burnt-offering the sacrifices commanded. *And Zadok;* the accusative is governed by the verb "*he left*," which must be supplied from v. 37. *Continually morning and evening;* according to the requirements of the law, Ex. xxix. 38. Num. xxviii. 3, 6. *And* (to offer the other burnt-offerings) *according to all that is written in the law of Moses.* Besides the *continual offering*, the daily sacrifice, the law required other burnt-offerings on the Sabbath, the feast days, &c., (see the law for the offerings at the feasts in Num. xxviii. seq.). Thus in the time of David the worship was performed at two places, where the sacred things, that had been handed down from the age of Moses, were preserved. The ark of the covenant was deposited in Jerusalem, and there Asaph and his brethren served before it as singers, Obed-edom and Chozah acted as door-keepers, and the priests named in v. 6 were simply employed in blowing the trumpets. The holy tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering stood in Gibeon, and there Heman and Jeduthun served as singers, the sons of Jeduthun as door-keepers, and Zadok and his brethren as priests, to offer the sacrifices there according to the law. This serves to explain the reason that Solomon offered the thousand burnt-offerings in Gibeon (1 Kings iii. 4). David, however, did not visit the sanctuary in Gibeon, as we learn from 1 Chr. xxi. 28, xxii. 1, but offered burnt-offerings upon the altar, which he had built in Jerusalem (xxi. 26, 30). The circumstances that led to the continuance of the worship at Gibeon, which consisted chiefly of the offering of sacrifices upon the altar of burnt-offering, we have no means of determining. Solomon appears to have been the first, who fully recognised the rights of Zadok and of the altar under his care, for he made Zadok high-priest (1 Kings ii. 27, 35); he also succeeded in bringing the altar of burnt-offering and the other holy things to Jerusalem (1 Kings viii. 4), and it was only because the old altar was too small, that the new one in the forecourt of the

temple was put in its place 2 Chr. iv. 1.—V. 41. *And with them* (viz., with Zadok and his sons) *were Heman and Jeduthun, and the rest of the chosen ones, who were appointed by name,* (chap. xii. 31) *to give thanks to Jehovah that His mercy is everlasting;* Heman and Jeduthun, and the singers under them, whose names are not given here though they are mentioned elsewhere and probably were given in the original record in this connection also, performed at the high place in Gibeon the same duties, as were entrusted to Asaph at the ark in Jerusalem (see vv. 5, 37). The names of those who were associated with Asaph are given in v. 5. Our historian probably attached greater importance to them, than to those who were stationed in Gibeon.—V. 42. If the text is correct here, the verse must be explained according to v. 5 somewhat as follows: *and with them* (viz. with the singers whose names are not given here) were Heman and Jeduthun (appointed) *as those who sounded the trumpets and cymbals, and the instruments of the song of God.* There is nothing to surprise us in the fact that Heman and Jeduthun are named twice (here and in v. 41), for Asaph is also mentioned twice in v. 5 in precisely the same way; but v. 5 leads us to conjecture that the reading of the original text was a follows: וְהֵימָן וִידוּתוּן בַּחֲצֹצְרוֹת וּבַמְצִלְתַּיִם מַשְׁמִיעִים וְעִמָּהֶם שְׁאָר הַבְּרוּרִים בִּכְלֵי שִׁיר הָאֱלֹהִים (and Heman and Jeduthun, with viols and nablia, and with them the rest of the chosen ones with the instruments of the song of God) for in *v.* 5 those who sounded the viols and nablia, which are probably the instruments here described as the instruments of the song of God, are contrasted with Asaph, who sounded the cymbals. This contrast is not expressed in any way in our present text, and there is sufficient to excite doubts as to its correctness in the fact, that its opening words are merely a repetition of the commencement of the previous verse, that the *lamed* stands before the participle מַשְׁמִיעִים (see on the other hand vv. 15, 16, 28, and chap. xvi. 6), and that the preposition *beth* is omitted before the trumpets, cymbals and instruments, whereas it is not omitted in any other instance (*e.g.* xv. 16, 19, 24, 28, xvi. 5). The rendering of this passage in the Septuagint is *καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν σάλπιγγες καὶ κύμβαλα τοῦ ἀναφωνεῖν* (לְהַשְׁמִיעַ) *καὶ ὄργανα τῶν ᾠδῶν τοῦ θεοῦ,* but it is not

easy to decide whether the translators had a different text before them, or whether they gave a free translation of the text, as we have it now, for the purpose of putting some kind of meaning into it. The *Vulgate* appears to contain a rendering of our text, but the translators have not succeeded in keeping closely to the original.—*For the door; i.e.* the sons of Jeduthun were door-keepers. Obed-edom, who was a doorkeeper to the ark of the covenant, was also a son of Jeduthun according to v. 38. We must therefore conclude that members of the same family were appointed as doorkeepers both at the ark and at the holy tabernacle in Gibeon.—V. 43. cf. 2 Sam. vi. 19 seq. *To bless his house* on this solemn feast day, as he had already pronounced a blessing on his people in the name of Jehovah. According to 2 Sam. vi. the account of Michal, the daughter of Saul, who received David with contemptuous words, when he returned to his house, ought to follow here; but although the historian evidently hints at the circumstance, he does not relate it. His work was not of such a nature as to leave him room to introduce purely personal matters and trifling incidents of this kind, for he was anxious to return as quickly as possible to his account of the sacred institutions.

7. CHAP. XVII.—CHAP. XXII.

DAVID WISHES TO BUILD A TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM. HE MAKES THE NECESSARY PREPARATIONS, BUT THE ERECTION OF THE BUILDING ITSELF IS LEFT FOR SOLOMON. CHAPS. XVIII.—XXI. FORM A PARENTHESIS CONTAINING ACCOUNTS OF DAVID'S WARS, HIS OFFICERS, &C.

1. Chap. xvii. cf. 2 Sam. vii.—V. 1. *In his house;* we have an account of the erection of this house in chap. xiv. 1 (cf. xv. 1). In 2 Sam. vii. 1 the words "his house" are followed by the clause, "*and when Jehovah had given him rest from all his enemies round about,*" and the events here narrated are assigned to the latter part of David's reign. The fact, that the many wars, in which David was engaged, are not mentioned earlier either in the book of Samuel, or that of Chronicles, may be ac-

counted for on the ground, that a strictly chronological arrangement was not intended. The accounts of the preparation of the tent for the ark of the covenant in Jerusalem and of the intended erection of the temple, which are closely connected so far as their contents are concerned, follow immediately the one upon the other.—*In a house of cedars;* the magnificent house, which had been built with the help of Hiram (chap. xiv. 1). *Under curtains;* an explanatory alteration of the expression in Samuel, *in the midst of curtains (Thenius).* V. 2. *Do all this in thine heart;* in 2 Sam. we have *go, do, &c.;* and we also find there, as in many other instances, *Elohim* in the place of *Jehovah.* Thus Nathan at first expresses approval of the king's intention, *bona intentione, et sincero animo, non tamen ex divina revelatione. (J. D. Michaelis).* It was not till afterwards that he learned that the period had not yet arrived for the fulfilment of this design.—V. 4. The question in 2 Sam. vii. "*shalt thou build,*" *&c.*, implies that he will not. In the passage before us it is altered into the negative clause "*thou shalt not build me a house,*" *&c.*, (cf. chap. xxii. 8). *A house to dwell in;* for לִשְׁבֶת we find in Sam. vii. בַּיִת לְשִׁבְתִּי; this is no doubt the original reading, as "*for my dwelling*" forms a direct contrast to the words which follow, "*I have not dwelt;*" and the *baith* in the following verse is also without the article.—V. 5. And I was *from one tent to another, and from one dwelling;* to render these words intelligible it is necessary to supply: *to another* (dwelling). The correct reading has been preserved in Samuel, "*and I was walking in a tent and in a dwelling;*" the text of the passage before us has originated in the alteration of מִתְהַלֵּךְ (walking) into מֵאֹהֶל (from a tent). The evident intention, as we may see from v. 6, was to lay stress upon the fact that God was a *mithhallek* (a travelling God) and went from one place to another with his *tent* and his entire *dwelling* (the dwelling included not merely the tent but the forecourts with the altar of burnt-offerings, &c.)—V. 6. In addition to minor points, there is this difference between 2 Sam. and our text, that instead of "*the judges of Israel*" we find in the former *the tribes of Israel*: "*spake I a word with any of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people, to the effect,*" *&c.* "As the whole section possesses a poetical character, and the expres-

sion 'to feed,' which follows, does not harmonise with 'the tribes,' it is possible that this word may be used in a figurative sense, viz., shepherd-staffs = shepherds = rulers, and thus denote the judges." *(Thenius)*. There can be no doubt that if we are anxious to retain the reading as it stands in Samuel, we must explain the word in some such way as this; for we read nothing about tribes who were commissioned to feed the congregation of Israel before the time of David, and the leaders, who had been called by God in earlier times, form a much more appropriate antithesis to David, than the tribes. But for that very reason, as it is easy to account for the alteration of שִׁפְטֵי into שִׁבְטֵי, by a copyist's oversight, seeing that *all Israel* had been mentioned just before, the reading of the Chronicles must be retained; and in my opinion this reading is confirmed by v. 10 and 2 Sam. vii. 11. *House of cedars;* a brief and expressive term for a house constructed of costly materials.—Vv. 7—14. *Words of the prophet Nathan.* V. 7. The reference in this verse is to the circumstances narrated in 1 Sam. xvi. 11.—V. 8. *And I cut off;* in 2 Sam. vii. the word in the original is written with the sign of motion (*a*), expressive of determination: *I resolved to cut off.* It follows from the context that this resolution was carried into effect.—*I have made thee a name;* 2 Sam. vii., "a *great* name." *Like the name of the great men that are on the earth;* for David had become the king of a great kingdom, and his fame could, therefore, be placed on a level with that of the powerful heathen kings, to whom the term *the great* was especially applied.—V. 9. *And I will give my people Israel a settled place, and will plant them, and they shall dwell in their place;* the perfects with *vav conjunctive* are not a continuation of the imperfects with vav conjunctive in v. 8; but after the enumeration of the blessings already bestowed upon David (v. 8), the promise is given, that Israel shall henceforth enjoy the blessings of David's age as a permanent inheritance, and shall dwell in safety in its own land. *And evil men shall not continue to waste them* (2 Sam. vii. *afflict* them) as in *the early times*, viz., when the Egyptians oppressed the people.—V. 10. *And up to the days* (the singular in 2 Sam. vii. points out the time with greater precision: from the present moment back to *the day) when I appointed judges.* These words denote the whole of the interval between

Joshua and Saul, in which the Israelites were frequently oppressed by heathen nations. *And I will subdue all thy enemies;* a continuation of the promise, which was commenced in v. 9. As God had already destroyed all the enemies of David, according to v. 8, and the promise refers to the enemies of Israel and not to those of David, the only way in which we can explain the use of the second person sing. suffix is by assuming, that the enemies of the people are at the same time regarded as the enemies of David himself. But the difficulty can be more easily removed by changing the suffix into the third person. The reading in 2 Sam. vii. 11 is, "I have given thee rest from all thine enemies;" and on comparing vv. 1 and 9 we shall see very clearly that the suffix ought to be changed from the second person to the third in the passage before us.—*And I have announced* (the imperfect with *Vav* as in v. 8) *to thee: "and a house will Jehovah build thee;"* our historical books do not inform us where and on what occasion this announcement was made by God to David (the first person refers to God, not to Nathan, as the reading in 2 Sam. vii., "*Jehovah telleth thee,*" clearly proves). The intention of the words is to give prominence to the fact that, according to the will and counsel of God, David was to receive a house, but not to build the temple (cf. v. 12); hence the reading in this verse, "*and I have announced,*" is to be regarded as the correct one. The house is not the palace, which David had built for himself, v. 25. The text of 2 Sam. vii., "*and Jehovah will announce to thee, that Jehovah will build thee a house,*" would have to be explained in this way: and Jehovah now announces to thee, through me, Nathan, that he will provide for thee a permanent and blessed house, that is, will bestow upon thy house blessing and prosperity, and give thee a perpetual posterity.—V. 11. *To go* (and lie) *with thy fathers* (Deut. xxxi. 16).—V. 12. *He shall build me a house;* in Samuel the reading is, "he shall build a house for my name," and instead of "his throne," we find in Samuel "the throne of his kingdom."—V. 13. "*He shall be my son;*" these words are followed in Samuel by a clause, which the historian has intentionally omitted here, viz., "if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men," *i.e.*, in precisely the same manner

as I punish other men—*I will not take away my mercy* (Sam. my mercy shall not depart); *Thenius* regards the text of the Chronicles as the original reading, because, according to the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, the *Syriac*, the *Arabic*, and some MSS., אסיר (I will take away) is the correct reading of the passage in Samuel also, and this reading is confirmed by the word הסירותי which follows. But this word may have caused the alteration from Kal into Hiphil.—*From him that was before thee, i.e.*, Saul; the name of Saul is given in Samuel, but was no doubt interpolated by a copyist, as an explanation of the words, which were clear enough already, and from which the name was intentionally omitted by the prophet. In consequence of this interpolation the words "I took away" ("put away," Eng. V.) have been repeated, and מִלְּפָנֶיךָ is used in the sense of לְפָנֶיךָ, as we have it in the Chronicles. The text of the Chronicles is in all respects sufficient, and bears the stamp of originality when compared with that of Samuel. *Thenius*, however, endeavours to prove that it is the result of conjecture.—V. 14. *And I will place him in my house and in my kingdom for ever* (cf. 2 Chr. ix. 8). It is evident that "*in my house*" means in my people Israel, in my congregation, since "*in my kingdom*" follows immediately afterwards. But it is worthy of note that the word kingdom is applied here to the kingdom of God, whereas in every other passage, in which it occurs in this section, it denotes the kingdom of David or of Solomon. We naturally expect the prophet to revert to David before concluding, after having spoken in vv. 11—13 of the building of Solomon's temple. The promise that his house should be blessed was intended as a compensation for the disappointment of his wish to build the temple, and hence this assurance is appropriately repeated at the conclusion of the prophet's address. The text of 2 Sam. vii. gives the termination of the address precisely in the form in which we should expect to find it: "*and thy house and thy kingdom will continue for ever before thee, and thy throne* (according to this our נכאן should be altered into נְכוֹן) *shall be established for ever.*"—V. 15. *This vision;* it is apparent from v. 3, that the *vision* of the prophet was a vision in a dream.

Vv. 16—27. Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 18—29. *David's thanksgiving for*

the promise made to him through Nathan.—V. 16. *Then king David went in;* viz., into the sanctuary which he had erected.—*Jehovah Elohim;* 2 Sam. vii. *Adonai Jehovah;* a difference in the text which did not affect the Masoretic punctuation. In both cases the Masorites read *Adonai Elohim.*—V. 17. למרחוק an accusative governed by תדבר, what *thou sayest* relates *to a distant period;* the reference here is to v. 14.—וראיתני כתור האדם למעלה (Eng. version "thou hast regarded me according to the estate of a man of high degree," Tr.); if instead of וראיתני we read והראיתני the meaning of these words will be: *and thou hast caused me as it were to see the succession of men from this time upwards;* in other words, the line of men, which stretched onward from David in an unbroken series into the remote future, appears as an ascending line rising upward to an immeasureable distance. Such a line was now presented to the view of David in the assurance that his throne should be firmly established to eternity, an assurance which involved the promise that the descendants of David should retain the government in an unbroken succession. The attempts made to explain the Kal וראיתני have all been unsuccessful. If the reading of our text is retained, we are forced to the assumption that תור is used here in the sense of תורה, but no evidence can be adduced in support of this assumption except the parallel passage in Samuel, where we find וזאת תורת האדא. And this would by no means clear away the difficulties, for even granting that the passage might mean, "*thou regardest me after the manner of men,*" *i.e.,* thou hast looked upon me as one with whom, although he is infinitely below thee, thou couldst converse after the manner of men, and hast not refused to speak to me as one man to another, the word המעלה would still need to be explained. Some have taken this word in connection with the clause which follows, and rendered it somewhat in this way: *thou regardest me after the manner of men, of whom God on high is the Lord* (*Luther* and *De Wette*). But this is altogether inadmissible, and hence in 2 Sam. vii., where תור is changed into תורת, the word המעלה has been omitted as superfluous. Other explanations, such for example as "et respexisti me juxta rationem hominis illius celsissimi" (*Schmidius*), are seen at once to be thoroughly arbitrary, the agreement with the Hebrew text being retained in appear-

ance only. The same may be said of the early versions (the *Septuagint*: *καὶ ἐπεῖδες με ὡς ὅρασις ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὕψωσάς με, Κύριε ὁ θεός*; *Vulgate*: *et fecisti me spectabilem super omnes homines, Domine Deus*), which merely serve to prove that at a very early period the text of this passage was unintelligible. We are therefore compelled to have recourse to an alteration of the text, and feel no hesitation in changing the Kal into Hiphil (reading "thou hast caused me to see" for "thou hast regarded me"), seeing that with this slight alteration the words would harmonize with the context, and the passage admit of an interpretation in all respects appropriate. The MSS. also furnish evidence that attempts have been made to render the passage intelligible by altering the text: thus some read בְּתוֹךְ (instead of בְּתוֹר) *thou regardest me on high in the midst of men*, thou givest me a preference above other men. The reading in the Chronicles is not an explanation of that in Samuel; on the contrary the original reading has been more closely retained in the former than in the latter, in which in fact it has been almost entirely obliterated by the alteration referred to and the omission of הראתני and המעלה.—V. 18. In the expression "*for the honour of thy servant*," the words "*of thy servant*" are omitted in the *Septuagint* and in 2 Sam. vii., and should certainly be erased from the text. The remainder of the passage, "*and what shall David still further add to thine honour*," corresponds with but little variation to 2 Sam vii.: "*and what shall David say more unto thee.*" The original text is undoubtedly found in the Book of Samuel, since the meaning of David evidently is, that God knows him, his servant, and therefore there is no necessity for him to give further expression to his feelings and his gratitude. —V. 19. *For thy servant's sake*; 2 Sam. vii.. *for thy word's sake.* The latter is clearly the original reading: *for thy word's sake and according to thy heart thou hast done all these great things, i.e.*, I attribute them to thy mercy alone. The concluding words of the verse must also be altered according to 2 Sam. vii., for the reading את־כל־הגדלות (all the great things) has evidently arisen from the words עַל כֵּן גָּדַלְתָּ (*therefore thou art great*), which we find in 2 Sam. vii. 22, but which are omitted from the Chronicles.— V. 21. Whom God *went* to redeem; *Thenius* (following the *Sep-*

tuagint, ὡδήγησεν αὐτόν) would substitute the Hiphil for the Kal here, and read: *whom God would have led, to redeem them to himself as a people* (cf. Deut. vii. 8, xiii. 5; from which passages, however, we should expect to find דִּרְצִיא, see the *Septuagint* at Josh. xxiv. 3, Ps. cvi. 9); but if we take אֲשֶׁר as an Accusative: *to whom God came, to redeem a people to himself*, there will be no ground at all for changing the Kal into Hiphil. The next clause is also unintelligible in the form in which it lies before us. According to 2 Sam. vii., where however the text is even more faulty than it is in this passage, "*and to do*" should be inserted after the words "make thee a name," thus: "*that thou mightest make thee a name, and do great and terrible things, to drive out the heathen nations before thy people, whom thou hast redeemed out of Egypt.*" Whether the text in Samuel should be altered accordingly is another question.—V. 24. *Let it even be established*: this is wanting in Samuel. It is repeated from *v.* 23 to show more clearly the connection with the words which follow, "*that thy name may be exalted.*" *Saying; i.e.*, in order that men may every where acknowledge it and *say*. The points of difference between this passage and that of Samuel are not of much importance. יהיה must be erased from the latter, for men are to say "*the house of David thy servant is established before thee*," not it will be established.—V. 25. For "*O my God*" we find in Samuel the fuller expression "*O Lord of hosts, God of Israel.*" After "*he hath found*," אֶת־לִבּוֹ, if not introduced into the text as in 2 Sam. vii., must be understood: *therefore thy servant hath taken heart* (gained courage) *to pray before thee, i.e.*, to offer this prayer to God. *The house, which God would build for David*, is to be understood (according to *v.* 10) as referring to the family, the dynasty of David.—V. 26. After "*thou art God*" we have in Samuel "and thy words are truth."—V. 27. הוֹאַלְתָּ לְבָרֵךְ; 2 Sam. vii. הוֹאֵל וּבָרֵךְ, the original reading, since it is not a reference to former blessings, but a prayer for the fulfilment of the promise, that is for the bestowal of fresh blessings, which most properly occurs at the end of the prayer. The conclusion, "*for thou blessest*" &c., is given in a much fuller form in 2 Sam. vii.: "for thou, O Lord God, hast spoken it, and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever."

2. CHAP. XVIII.—CHAP. XXI.

ACCOUNT OF DAVID'S WARS, &C.

Chap. xviii. V. 1; cf. 2 Sam. viii. 1, where the latter part of the verse reads thus: *and David took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines, i.e.,* he deprived them of the power which they had hitherto exercised over Israel, as it is also stated in Ecclus. xlvii. 7: Ἕως σήμερον συνέτριψεν αὐτῶν κέρας. In the passage before us we read of a victory over the Philistines, by which *Gath and her daughters,* that is, no doubt, the Philistine city of Gath and the whole of the district belonging to it, came into David's possession. There is something singular in this account, for, in the time of Solomon, Gath was an independent state, governed by a king of its own. For this reason some have thought, that the reference here is not to Gath of the Philistines, but to Gath Rimmon in the tribe of Dan, which the Philistines held till the time of David (the latter fact they consider themselves justified in deducing from the passage before us). But the words of the historian apparently refer to a more important event, than the recovery of a small Israelitish town. We are unable to tell on what ground the historian interpreted the passage in Samuel, as denoting the capture of Gath and the province connected with it.

[*Keil* (p. 41) sees no difficulty here. He says: "If *Metheg-Ammah* means (as *Winer* supposes) the *bridle of the capital (frenum metropoleos)*, the paraphrase of the Chronicles is quite correct, for then the expression 'he took Metheg-Ammah out of the hand of the Philistines' would mean, he took away from the capital its supremacy over the Philistines. But if it means *arm-bridle* (as *Gesenius* explains it in his history of the Hebrew language, though he rejects this explanation in the Thesaurus and silently follows Winer) the meaning of the passage is, 'David brought the Philistines under his sway.' In either case it is evident that the author of the Chronicles has correctly interpreted the words of the Book of Samuel, though he has merely paraphrased them."]

Ver. 2. Cf. 2 Sam. viii. 2, where a somewhat different account is given of the treatment, to which the Moabite prisoners were subjected ("he measured them with a line casting them down to the ground, even with two lines measured he to put to death,) and with one full line to keep alive, and so the Moabites became David's servants.") It was probably in this war with Moab that *Benaiah* slew the two sons of the Moabite king (cf. chap. xi. 22.)

Vv. 3—8. cf. 2 Sam. viii. 3 seq. V. 3. *To establish*; in 2 Sam. we find "to recover," but the reading of the Chronicles must be substituted in Samuel also. *Thenius* follows the earlier expositors, and assumes that David must be understood as the subject of the clause "*when he went to strengthen his hand by the Euphrates.*" The meaning of the verse would then be that, "when he was seeking to accomplish the important task of securing at least one point, in which his kingdom might touch the Euphrates, this being the nearest river which flowed through extensive provinces," he defeated Hadarezer the King of Aram who opposed his expedition. But the position of the clause itself and the introduction of the name of David as the subject of ver. 4 (David took from him, &c.) render it more probable that the words in question refer to Hadarezer *(J. H. Michaelis, Ewald)*, so that they merely serve to fix the time when David gained the victory over Hadarezer. The situation of Zobah is more particularly described in the words "*towards Hamath*" (cf. 2 Chr. viii. 3), which are omitted from Samuel; but they do not enable us to determine its position with accuracy. *Zobah* is neither the town of *Nisibis* in Mesopotamia, as the earlier expositors and even *J. H. Michaelis* suppose (all that we learn from 2 Sam. x. 16 is that the influence of the king of Zobah extended even to the countries to the east of the Euphrates), nor the town of Haleb or Aleppo in Syria, to which the Jews of the middle ages gave the name of Zoba. On the contrary Zobah was most probably situated on the east (or a little to the north east, *Thenius*) of Damascus (cf. *Ewald* who identifies Zobah with the Zoba of Ptolemy.) *Hamath* was the well-known city of the Orontes, which was afterwards called Epiphaneia, and is now one of the most important cities in the Cis-Asiatic countries. *Hadarezer*; the name always occurs in this form in the Chronicles and

in 2 Sam. x. 16—19, but in 2 Sam. viii. 3 he is called Hadad-ezer. The latter is evidently the original form, since Hadad, the name of a Syrian deity, is frequently met with in Syrian proper names. V. 4. *And David took from him a thousand chariots*; the word *chariots* does not occur in the parallel passage in Samuel, but must be supplied from our text. Instead of 7000 horsemen, the number given in Samuel is 700; but "7000 horsemen would be in better proportion to 20,000 foot soldiers in the plains of Mesopotamia" *(Thenius)*; cf. chap. xix. 18. —*Then David lamed all the chariots, i.e.*, he lamed the horses and so made all the chariots useless (cf. Josh. xi. 6, 9); he merely reserved 100 chariots, including of course the horses belonging to them, either as a memorial of the victory *(Thenius)*, or to take them with him to Jerusalem in a triumphal procession, and afterwards destroy them *(Ewald)*. V. 5. *Darmesek* (another name for Damascus) only occurs here and in the following verse, V. 6. After the decisive engagement, in which 22,000 Syrians were slain, David appointed *governors* or *officials* in the kingdom of Damascus. The word נְצִיבִים is omitted from our text, but must be supplied from 2 Sam. viii.; see below at v. 13, where the concluding words of the verse occur again. V. 7. *The golden armour*; not the golden shields *(cf. Thenius.)* *Upon the servants*; this is the correct reading, and the אֶל in 2 Sam. viii. must be altered into עַל. *Brought them to Jerusalem*; after these words the Septuagint contains the following clause in Sam. viii: *and Shishak, the king of Egypt, took them, when he attacked Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam the son of Solomon.* According to *Thenius* this clause originally formed part of the Hebrew text, see the *Septuagint* at 1 Kings xiv. 26. V. 8. *From Tibchath* (2 Sam. viii. *from Betach*); both of these readings may have sprung from Tebach, and this we regard as the original name, since we meet with it as the name of an Aramaean district or town belonging to the descendants of Nahor, Gen. xxii. 24. Whether Tebach may be set down as identical with the modern town of Taibeh, which is placed on the most recent maps to the north of Tadmor, under 35 deg. north lat., apparently on a caravan road from Aleppo to the Euphrates, is very questionable, for there is but little resemblance between the two names Taibeh and Tebach. *From Chun* (2 Sam. *from Berothai*)

the names are only to be met with in these two passages, for the conjecture that Berothai was the same place as the Berothah mentioned in Ezek. xlvii. 16 (*cf. Hitzig*) is hardly admissible, the towns of Hadadezer being situated farther to the east than the town of Berothah referred to in Ezekiel, which from the context either stood directly upon the Mediterranean Sea, or at least very near to the coast. What connection there is between the names Chun and Berothai we cannot determine. The supposition, which has frequently been expressed, that Chun was a later name for Berothai, has no further evidence to support it. As the agreement between the text of the two books in other cases would suggest the probability, that originally the same name occurred in both, and since it is possible that in consequence of obliterations Chun may have grown out of Berothai, we agree with *Thenius* in thinking the latter name the original reading. *Ewald*, in his Geschichte des Volks Israel, connects Berothai with Barathena (*Ptolem.* geogr. v. 19), which was situated in the same latitude as Damascus, but nearer to the Euphrates. רבה מאד (2 Sam. viii. הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד); the reading in Samuel is more in accordance with the earliest usage, but is sometimes met with in the Chronicles (I. xx. 2). The concluding words "*therewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars and the vessels of brass*," are omitted from the Hebrew text of 2 Sam. viii. but not from the *Septuagint*, where we find them in a somewhat more expanded form; they are also given in the *Vulgate*. It is therefore natural to suppose that they originally formed part of the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel.

Vv. 9—11. cf. 2 Sam. viii. 9—12.—V. 9 *Tou;* in 2 Sam. *Toi*. It is evident from verse 3 that the land of Hadadezer was contiguous to the territory of king Toú of Hamath; and although we meet with Hamath-zobah in 2 Chr. viii. 3, the combination merely furnishes a more precise description of the situation of Hamath, but fails to convey any information to us, since we have no definite account of the extent of the kingdom of Zobah. Toú made presents to David, because the victory which David had gained over Hadadezer had delivered him from a powerful enemy, who had already made attempts to subdue his neighbour, as *v.* 10 evidently shows.—V. 10. *Hadoram;* the name

Joram has been written by mistake in 2 Sam. viii.; the latter is a purely Israelitish name, and therefore we should not expect to find it as the name of an Aramaean. The name Hadoram occurs in chap. i. 21 in the midst of Arabic names. We also find it in 2 Chr. x. 18 as a somewhat altered form of Adoram, 1 Kings xii. 18. לִשְׁאֹל לוֹ לִשְׁלוֹם, not as the Septuagint renders it, *τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην*, and the *Vulgate, ut postularet ab eo pacem*, but *to greet him* (cf. Genesis xliii. 27).—אִישׁ מִלְחֲמוֹת, according to chap. xxviii. 3 and Is. xlii. 13, is *one who wages wars;* but in this passage it is more precisely defined by the name Toú, which is governed by the construct state. Hadadezer is here described as *a man of the wars of Toú*, that is, one who had made war upon Toú (cf. Is. xli. 12, *the men of thy war*). The closing words of the verse, *and all kinds of vessels of gold and silver and brass*, are in the accusative, and governed by the verb *he sent;* in 2 Sam. viii. they form a distinct sentence, "*in the land of Hadoram were all kinds of vessels*," *&c.*—V. 11. The silver and gold *which he had taken* (2 Sam. which he had dedicated); according to the reading of our text David consecrated to Jehovah all the silver and gold which he had taken from the subjugated tribes; but this does not harmonise with the account contained in the Septuagint at 2 Sam. viii. 7, from which we learn that the golden armour of the warriors of Hadadezer was not placed in the sanctuary of Jehovah. Hence the reading in Samuel must be preferred, and the meaning of the passage evidently is that David dedicated the presents of Toú to the sanctuary, for which he had already determined to set apart a portion of the booty taken from the conquered kings. The last words of the verse, "*from all nations; from Edom and from Moab, and from the sons of Ammon, and from the Philistines and from Amalek*," are given more fully in 2 Sam. viii., as follows: *from all nations whom he had conquered, from Aram* (for which, according to the passage before us, and according to the Septuagint and the Syriac versions of Samuel itself, *Edom* must be substituted, since the plunder obtained from Aram is mentioned again immediately after as that taken from Hadadezer, and Edom is more appropriately placed next to Moab, which bordered on Edom, than Aram would be) *and from Moab and from the*

sons of Ammon, and from the Philistines, and from Amalek, and from the spoil of Hadadezer the son of Rehob, king of Zoba.

Vv. 12, 13; cf. 2 Sam. viii. 13, 14.—V. 12. We must not shrink from attempting to ascertain the connection between these two accounts, which differ so widely the one from the other. As the concluding words, "*in the valley of salt eighteen thousand*" (for which, through a copyist's error, we find *twelve thousand* in Ps. lx. 2), also occur in 2 Sam. viii. 13, we must necessarily assume that, notwithstanding the different readings at the commencement of the verse, the two passages refer to the same event. The text of 2 Sam. viii. 13 is quite unintelligible in the form in which we have it now. If we examine the superscription of Ps. lx. (which is taken from the Book of Samuel, like the superscriptions in the neighbouring Psalms, and is therefore of importance for the interpretation, or rather we may say for the restoration, of the text), and 1 Kings xi. 15, we cannot doubt that the suffix in בשובו (*on his return*) relates to Joab ben Zeruiah. We conjecture, then, that the two passages, viz., that in the Chronicles and the parallel passage in Samuel, contain each a portion of the original reading, which may therefore be restored by combining the two so as to read, "*and Joab the son of Zeruiah smote Edom, when he returned from the conquest of Aram in the valley of salt,* 18,000 *men.*" We take no notice here of the words of 2 Sam. viii. 13, "*and David gat him a name,*" since they do not affect the explanation of the text of the Chronicles, and proceed at once to the words which follow, viz., "*when he returned from the conquest of Aram.*" By the omission of the name Joab ben Zeruiah (which may have been left out by a careless copyist, who thought it unnecessary here, as it occurs again at *v.* 16) and of the words "*he smote Edom*" (an omission which may readily be explained, as the eye might easily pass from this expression to the similar one further on "*from smiting Aram*"), the text which has come down to us in the book of Samuel may have grown out of that which we have given above. The reading in the Chronicles can also be traced to the restored texts as given above, since the words "*on his return from smiting Aram*" might easily be overlooked on account of their resemblance to the preceding words "*he smote Edom,*" and some reader who doubted the correctness of the text may have been induced to substitute the name of Abishai ben

Zeruiah, which he missed from the list of names in *v.* 15 sqq., for that of Joab ben Zeruiah which occurs immediately after. The present readings in 2 Sam. viii. and in the Chronicles are thus shown to point to the text, as restored by their aid, and the contents of this restored text are in harmony with the account contained in 1 Kings xi. 15 and Ps. lx. 2. It may indeed be said, that we are not justified in seeking such a harmony, since it is possible, either that different events are referred to in the passages quoted, or that different accounts existed of the same event. Thus for example *Movers* says (p. 170): "according to 2 Sam. viii. 13, David slew the Edomites in the valley of salt; the superscription of Ps. lx. refers this slaughter to Joab, the commanding officer, whilst the author of the Chronicles, copying almost verbatim from the Book of Samuel, substitutes Abishai the son of Zeruiah, an alteration which he could only have been induced to make by the account contained in some other historical work." Earlier expositors on the other hand (*e.g. Buxtorf* Vind. p. 401 sqq. *Pfeiffer* dub. Vex. p. 461 seq. *J. H. Michaelis* in loco) reconcile the different statements somewhat in the following manner. Abishai ben Zeruiah slew the Edomites (according to the passage before us), and after them their allies (?) the Syrians (according to 2 Sam. viii). He slew 18,000 in the first engagement (?), and then a second attack was made by Joab ben Zeruiah (according to 1 Kings xi. 15), in which 12,000 men were slain (Ps. lx. 2); *Keil* p. 239 gives a similar explanation. (The explanation given by *Keil* is not quite the same; he says "the account of the Chronicles is taken from a historical source, for the author of the Chronicles introduces the special information that it was Abishai the son of Zeruiah who slew the Aramaeans (? the Edomites). It cannot have been taken from the superscription to the Psalm, for it differs in two respects: (1) it gives 18,000 as the number of the slain (the same number is given in Samuel) and only 12,000 are mentioned in the Psalm. *J. H. Michaelis* in Ps. lx. 2 has shown that there is no actual discrepancy between the two statements, and cites a striking case in point from the seven years' war. (2) It attributes the victory to Abishai, and the superscription to the Psalm ascribes it to Joab. This difference was solved by *Calvin*, and after him by *J. D. Michaelis* as follows: Joab may have commanded the

army, but a detachment, led by Abishai, may have attacked the Edomites and slain them. In this case the victory would just as properly be attributed to the commander in chief as to the subordinate officer." (*Chronik* p. 239, 240 *Tr.*).—It is at once apparent that the solution offered by *Buxtorf* and the others is not admissible. The variations in individual notices, occurring in passages that agree almost word for word, point to a common original text, which has been mutilated by subsequent alterations; and hence our task is to restore the text to its primitive form. *Ewald* and *Thenius* admit this, and though they have attempted to solve the difficulty in a somewhat different way, in the essential points we are agreed.—V. 13. *Then the Edomites became subject to David;* in 2 Sam. viii. it is said still more emphatically, *he appointed officers in all Edom, and all the Edomites became subject to David.* We can hardly suppose that the clause, "*he appointed officers in all Edom,*" has been intentionally omitted, since it may easily have been dropped from the text by mistake on account of its resemblance to the preceding clause. On the last clause of the verse *cf.* v. 6; the account of the wars with Edom is here brought to a close.

V. 14—17; *cf.* 2 Sam. viii. 15—18.—V. 14. The summary contained in this verse forms a conclusion not only to the brief account of the wars of David given in this chapter, but to the whole of the history of David's reign. Its position here in the centre of that history can only be explained on the supposition that in the original source from which this account of the wars was drawn, it did stand at the end of the history of David along with the list of officers which follows. The history of Saul is brought to a close in 1 Sam. xiv. 47—52 with the same details, and in very similar words.—V. 16. *Abimelek;* the correct reading is *Ahimelek,* which we find in 2 Sam. viii. and the other passages in which the name occurs (*e.g.* 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, 6). It is singular that this Ahimelek should be called a son of Abiathar, for according to 1 Sam. xxii. 20 Abiathar was a son of Ahimelek, and in other passages Zadok, of the line of Eleazar, and Abiathar, of the line of Ithamar, are mentioned together as the two high priests in the time of David (*e.g.* 2 Sam. xv. 24, 35, xx. 25). *Thenius* and *Ewald* (Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 596) are therefore of opinion that the names must be here transposed so as to read Abiathar *the son of Ahime-*

lek. We should not hesitate to bring this passage into harmony with the account in 1 Sam. xxii. 20 by means of such a transposition were it not that a high priest Ahimelek is spoken of in 1 Chr. xxiv. 3—31 along with Zadok, and in v. 6 he is called the son of Abiathar. The high priests of the line of Ithamar, whom we must keep in view when pronouncing upon the reading in question, were the following: Ahiah or Ahimelek, his son Abiathar, his son Ahimelek. We frequently find the grandfather and grandson called by the same name (see, for example, the list of high priests of the line of Eleazar, 1 Chr. v. 30—41). Hence the author of the Chronicles was acquainted with an Ahimelek, son of Abiathar, who discharged the duties of high priest in David's reign, and during the lifetime of his father (for Abiathar was living in the time of Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 27). This Ahimelek is mentioned here, as well as in 1 Chr. xxiv. 36 and 31, in connexion with Zadok. The historical books do not furnish us with any information as to the circumstances which led to Ahimelek's appointment as high-priest during his father's lifetime, or as to the reason why Ahimelek is not mentioned in connexion with the deposition of Abiathar by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 27, 35). But so much is certain that we have no right to alter the reading of the text and, by a transposition of the names, read *Abiathar the son of Ahimelek* for *Ahimelek the son of Abiathar*, for in that case we should have to alter *Ahimelek* into *Abiathar* in 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, and *Ahimelek the son of Abiathar* into *Abiathar the son of Ahimelek* in chap. xxiv. 6, and again *Ahimelek* into *Abiathar* in v. 31.—*Savsha* (2 Sam. xiv. *Seraiah*); the text contains the original reading; for in 1 Kings iv. 3 the same man, as we may safely assume, is spoken of under the name of *Shisha*, and in 2 Sam xx. 25 under that of *Sheva* or *Sheja*; which of these three names is correct we are not in a position to decide.—V. 17. *And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the Kreti and Pleti*; the same words occur in 2 Sam. xx. 23, and the reading of 2 Sam. viii. 18, which is founded upon 1 Kings i. 38, 44, must be corrected accordingly. On the Kreti and Pleti who formed the special body-guard of David (2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 18, xx. 7, 23; 1 Kings i. 38, 44), see my Beiträge zur Geschichte der Israeliten p. 186—200.—On *Benaiah* see 1 Chr. xi. 22—25. —*And the sons of David were the first by the side of the king;*

we have here an explanation of the obsolete word *Cohanim*, which is applied to the sons of David in 2 Sam. viii. 18. This view of the connexion between the word *Cohanim* and the reading in the passage before us is confirmed by 1 Kings iv. 5, where the words כֹּהֵן רֵאָה occur together in the sense of *minister*.

(On this *Keil* has the following fuller note: "*Gesenius* and *Winer* have both denied that *Cohanim* in the Book of Samuel denotes superior officers, and maintain that David had actually *priests* (house or palace-priests) among his own sons. But apart from the impossibility of proving the existence of such palace-priests, this supposition falls at once to the ground from the fact, that *Cohen* first received the meaning of *priest* from common usage and not from the etymology, and that the context prohibits the application of this usage in the case before us. The radical signification of *Cohen*, in the Arabic, is *res alicujus gerere, to act as the plenipotentiary of another*, in the Syriac *cehan* means *dives, gloriosus fuit*, and the adjective *cahinoh, locuples, dives*. In the latter sense the word *Cohanim* is used in Job xii. 19, where the parallel word '*the mighty*' shews that it can only refer to secular magnates (cf. *Rosenmüller* Schol. ad h. l.) It is in this earlier sense, 'men of high rank,' 'plenipotentiaries of the king,' that the word is used here and in the Book of Samuel. For it is evident that the reference cannot be to actual priests, since Zadok and Ahimelek are mentioned in v. 17 as priests of the tribe of Levi. And the author felt it to be unnecessary to observe that the sons of David were *Cohanim* in a different sense, for he could assume that every theocrat would know this very well. The sons of David had this title given them, because they were the mediators and representatives of the king, just as the priests were mediators between the people and the invisible king of the theocracy." *Chronik* p. 347.)

Chap. xix.—xx. 3. On chap. xix. cf. 2 Sam. x. Between the history of the wars of David, contained in 1 Chr. xviii., and that of his wars with the sons of Ammon and Aram in 1 Chr. xix., we find in 2 Sam. ix. an account of David's conduct towards Saul's son Mephibosheth (Meribosheth), which was necessarily omitted from the Chronicles as not coming within the scope of the work. —V. 1. *After that*; a loose formula of connexion, intended undoubtedly to give some chronological arrangement to the diffe-

rent accounts, though it is evident that they do not follow one another in a strictly chronological order. The use of this formula, therefore, in the passage before us is not at variance with the opinion that the chapter contains a more detailed account of the wars with Aram and Hadadezer, to which a brief reference had already been made in chap. xviii. 3—5. *Nachash* (a name which has been omitted by a simple oversight, from 2 Sam. x. 1) was the king of Ammon, with whom Saul is said in 1 Sam. xi. 1 to have carried on war. The friendly connexion which existed between Nachash and David, according to the account in the Chronicles, may perhaps have been occasioned by the hostile relation in which both of them stood to Saul. After *his son*, the name Hanun should be inserted; it is found in 2 Sam. x. 1, and is very appropriately given at the commencement of an account of Hanun himself.—V. 2. The text of 2 Sam. x. differs in certain words from the passage before us, but the only instance in which it is allowable to alter one text from the other is in the case of אֶל אָבִיו for which עַל may be substituted, cf. Is. xxii. 4; Ezek. xiv. 22.—V. 3. The first question, "*doth David honour thy father?*" is introduced with הֲ, the second with הֲלֹא, because a negative reply is expected to the former, an affirmative to the latter. After the words "*to search*" we must supply "*the city*" (2 Sam. x.), *i.e.*, the capital of Ammon (Rabba); the infinitives, which follow, with their object *the land* must be transposed, and connected together as in 2 Sam. x., after erasing the word *Erez* (land) with the suffix, for *spying* must precede overthrowing, and the latter word, according to its signification, is applicable to a city rather than a land.—V. 4. *And shaved them;* in 2 Sam. x. we have the more particular account *he shaved off the half of their beard, i.e.*, he shaved off the beard from one half of their face. מִדּוּדִים only occurs here and at 2 Sam. x. (cf. the cognate word מַד, Lev. vi. 3) it is used for *clothes which reach to the feet;* they were cut off by the Ammonites *in the middle*, that is, the skirt was cut off as high up as "their hinder parts." *V.* 5. "*And they went;*" these words are not required on account of the preceding expression, *he sent them away*, and are omitted from 2 Sam. x. *And information was brought to David respecting these men;* the same words occur in the *Septuagint* version of Samuel, but the words "*respecting these*

men" are wanting in the Hebrew text. The ambassadors had probably come as far as *Jericho* on their way back from the land of the Ammonites, they were to tarry there till the mark of the insult they had received had disappeared, and then *return* to Jerusalem. V. 6. התבאשו (the Niphal is used in 2 Sam. x.) the Hithpael of this verb only occurs here. In the later period of the language the Hithpael was frequently employed for the Niphal. The Niphal with את (2 Sam. xvi. 21) answers to the construction with את here. The words, *a thousand talents of silver to hire them chariots and horsemen from Aram-Naharaim, and from Aram Maachah, and from Zobah,* are omitted from 2 Sam. x., where nothing is said of the price at which the troops were hired; but the tribes who were ready to furnish them, are mentioned at once in words which differ but little from the first part of verse 7. Instead of *Aram-Naharaim* we find in Samuel *Aram-beth-Rehob,* it is probable that Beth-rehob was supposed to be the same city as *Rehoboth-hannahar,* which is mentioned in Gen. xxxvi. 37, and hence the uncommon name Aram-beth-Rehob was exchanged for the well-known name *Aram of the two rivers.* But this explanation could hardly be correct, for it is expressly said that it was not till a later period of the war that the inhabitants of Aram beyond the Euphrates, *i.e.* in Mesopotamia, took part in the war (cf. v. 16), and, therefore, we must look for Aram-beth-Rehob in the neighbourhood of the country of the Ammonites. We conjecture that it was that part of Syria, in which, according to Judg. xviii. 28, the city of Beth-Rehob stood; the position of this city we cannot more exactly determine, but it must have been somewhere near the southern slope of Antilebanon. *Aram-maachah* (called simply Maachah in 2 Sam. x.), the country by which the possessions of the Israelites on the east of the Jordan were bounded towards the north (Deut. iii. 14; Josh. xii. 5, xiii. 11); the statement of *Jerome* agrees with this, viz., that the city of Maachah was situated at the sources of the Jordan on the western slope of the southern portion of Antilebanon (cf. v. *Raumer,* Palestine Ed. 2, p. 206). We have no account in the Old Testament of the extent of this small kingdom of Maachah. *Zobah* (called in Samuel Aram-Zobah); on the situation of Zobah see chap. xviii. 3. V. 7. *And they hired thirty and two thousand chariots, and the king of Maachah and his*

people; according to 2 Sam. x. 6 Aram Beth-Rehob, and Aram contributed 20,000 foot soldiers, the king of Maachah 1000 men, and the kingdom of Tob 12,000 men. Thus the numbers agree, for the 20,000 and 12,000 are the 32,000 of the Chronicles, to which must be added the people of the king of Maachah, who, according to the more precise account of the Book of Samuel, furnished 1000 men. The difference in the two accounts consists in this, (1) that the land of Tob, which must have been somewhere near the other countries mentioned here, is altogether omitted from the Chronicles, for what reason we cannot tell (*Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 617 identifies Tob with the Θαῦβα of Ptolemy, a place in the desert of Arabia, but the passages of the Old Testament, in which the land of Tob is referred to, indicate a more northerly position), and (2) that the mercenary troops are described in the Chronicles as רכב, and according to the previous verse *Receb* and *Perashim*, whereas in Samuel they are said to have been all *foot soldiers*,—a remarkable statement, when we consider that in other passages (*e.g.* 1 Chr. xviii. 4) the King of Zobah is said to have had a great number of war chariots and horsemen at his disposal. The account contained in the verse before us of the *encampment* of the mercenary troops before *Medeba*, a city of the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 16), and the statement that whilst they were besieging this city, *the Ammonites gathered together from their cities &c.*, are omitted from the text of Samuel. They certainly rest upon a historical basis, and were taken by the author of the Chronicles from the sources employed by him; they may perhaps have originally formed part of the text of Samuel, and from some oversight may have been omitted.

(On the difficulty connected with the numbers given in this passage *Keil* says: "It is evident that both passages are corrupt. It is true that the accounts agree as to the number of men whom the Ammonites hired, viz., 32,000 men, and 1000 men from the king of Maachah, but according to the Chronicles the 32,000 were not infantry but *Receb* (chariot-soldiers, or war-chariots with horses), and yet 40,000 foot soldiers were slain; according to the Book of Samuel the Ammonites hired none but infantry, and yet in the battle there were 700 *Receb* and 40,000 *Perashim* (horsemen) slain. It is not easy to determine how the two accounts are to be reconciled. For the plan, suggested by *Calmet*,

J. H. Michaelis and others, of combining them seems somewhat forced. There are probably copyists' errors in both passages. But, as *Clericus*, *Michaelis*, and others have already said, there is more internal probability in the statement contained in the Chronicles that 7000 *Recheb* were slain and 40,000 foot soldiers, than in that of Samuel that 40,000 horsemen were slain, and only 700 *Recheb*, and no foot soldiers at all." Chronik. p. 324). V. 8. *The whole army*; the article in this passage in Samuel shows more clearly that the expression "*the mighty men*," is in apposition to "*the army*;"—viz., *the whole army, the Gibborim*. *Thenius* is of opinion that the copula has been dropt, and that the text should be restored so as to read, *the whole army and the Gibborim*. It is true that in 2 Sam. xv. 17 *the whole people*, and in 2 Sam. xx. 7, *the men of Joab and the Kreti and Pleti*, are mentioned in connection with Gibborim; but so far as I can remember, the rest of the warriors are never called *the whole army* in distinction from the Gibborim. It is evident from vv. 10, 11, that the rest of the warriors, as well as the Gibborim, took part in this war; but it does not therefore follow that they must be mentioned in this verse by the side of the Gibborim.—V. 9. *Outside the city*; *i.e.*, the city into which they withdrew after their defeat (v. 15). It must therefore have been the capital of the Ammonites, *Rabbah*, which was certainly the only one of the Ammonitish cities that was sufficiently fortified or large enough to afford a safe retreat to the conquered army. *And the kings that were come* (in 2 Sam. x., the four powers, which had sent auxiliary troops, are mentioned again by name) arranged the order of battle *for themselves alone upon the field*, after they had left the camp before Medeba and come near to the Ammonitish army. Instead of *outside the city*, we find in 2 Sam. x. *outside the gate* (of the city of Rabbah). Our reading is preferable as being the more intelligible, for the context evidently shows that the city of Rabbah is meant; and the very indefinite expression *outside the gate* does not harmonize with the peculiar clearness of the rest of the account; moreover, the words in v. 15 and 2 Sam. x. 14 "*they entered into the city*" require the reading "*outside the city*," rather than "the gate," in the passage before us.—V. 10. *The face of the battle &c.*; *i.e.*, the *battle-array* of the two armies was directed against him: the

Ammonites were drawn up *in front*, and the auxiliary troops which had advanced from Medeba were *behind*. Joab himself, at the head of a select body of soldiers, attacked the latter, which formed the stronger power, and is designated by the common name of *Aram*.—V. 11. His brother Abishai, with the rest of the army, was directed to attack the Ammonites. V. 12. והושעתיך (2 Sam. x. והלכתי להושיע לך); in the mouth of Joab, who was resolved to fight bravely, but knew well that the results were in the hands of God, the expression was very seemly, "*I will go to bring thee help*," I will try to help thee.—V. 13. *Let us behave ourselves*; the particle of motion (*He*) is appended to make the hortative character of the word more apparent, but the word may have the same meaning when used without the particle, as in 2 Sam. x.—*For our people and for the cities of our God*, that these may not fall into the hands of the enemy and so be given up to their gods.—V. 14. *Before Aram to battle* (2 Sam. x. *to battle against Aram*). When the Ammonites had retreated within the walls of their fortified city Rabbah, which the Israelites did not succeed in taking till the following year (chap. xx. 1), the war against Ammon was not carried any farther for the present.—V. 16. After their defeat the warriors of the countries designated by the common name of Aram assembled once more, and sent messengers to the Syrians beyond the Euphrates to induce them to join them in the war. According to the more precise account given in 2 Sam. x. 16, Hadadezer caused them to take part in the war; and from this statement as well as from the notice that his general *Shophach* was placed at their head, it seems to follow that the power of Hadadezer extended beyond the Euphrates, and that there were certain provinces to the east of the river, governed it may be by petty princes, which were dependent upon him and obliged to render assistance when required.—V. 17. *And came to them*; in 2 Sam. x. 17 we find "*and came to Helam*," the place in which, according to the previous verse, the Syrians had been gathered together; for חילם in 2 Sam. x. 16 is undoubtedly only a somewhat altered mode of writing חֵלָאם or חֵלָם, and in both passages the *Septuagint* and *Syriac*, and in the latter the *Vulgate*, treat the word as a proper name and write *Αιλάμ* ܚܠܡ *Helam*. Some MSS. of

the Septuagint read Χαλαμάκ, in which we may easily detect the Hebrew *Halamah*. It is true that no place of that name is mentioned anywhere else in the Old Testament, and this may account for the fact that, in the first instance, it is omitted from the Chronicles, and in the second is changed into אֲלֵהֶם (*to them*), by which the superfluous remark, "*he came to them and drew up the army against them*," which was already implied in the next clause, was introduced into the text. *Thenius* thinks that the text of the Chronicles contains the original reading; but I am unable to perceive in what way the reading of Samuel could easily be derived from that of the Chronicles by the transposition of letters, and mere conjecture. It must also be borne in mind that in *Josephus* (Antiq. vii. 6. 3) the word occurs as a proper name. He considers Chelam to have been the name of a powerful king of the Syrians on the East of the Euphrates, who sent his general Sabekos with an army of 80,000 foot and 10,000 cavalry to the assistance of the Ammonites. *Ewald* supposes Chelam to have been the name of a place corresponding to the city of Alamatha mentioned by Ptolemy geogr. xv. 5, the situation of which would answer very well to the description given here (compare chap. xviii. 3, "*when he went to strengthen his hand on the Euphrates*)."—V. 18. By *Aram* we must understand all the allied Syrians. Instead of 7000 chariots and 40,000 *foot-soldiers* we find in 2 Sam. x. 700 chariots and 40,000 horsemen. According to vv. 6 and 7 of this chapter and other passages chariots and horsemen constituted the principal force of the Syrians; and for this very reason it is all the more striking that in the present instance the Book of Chronicles should speak of foot-soldiers instead of horsemen. The statements are evidently inaccurate, for in Samuel the foot-soldiers are altogether omitted and in Chronicles the horsemen. We may perhaps possess a more detailed description of this victory of David in 1 Chr. xviii. 3 seq., and 2 Sam. viii. 3 seq., for it is not improbable that the brief notice contained in those passages refers to the decisive victory over Hadadezer, of which we have again an account in this same chapter in a more extended history of the wars with the Syrians.—V. 19. *The servants of Hadadezer* are, according to 2 Sam. x., the kings of the petty Syrian kingdoms which were dependent upon Hadadezer. The points in which the text of

this verse differs from that of Samuel are to be regarded as unintentional alterations, such as always occur where an exact copy is not specially aimed at.—Chap. xx. 1—3; cf. 2 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 26, 30, 31, where the conquest of Rabbah is connected with the history of Uriah. The Ammonites, having lost the support of the Syrians, are defeated and punished with the greatest severity for their ignominious treatment of the ambassadors of David (chap. xix. 4).—V. 1. *At the time of the turn of the year, the time when kings march out; i.e.*, at the beginning of the year, in the spring, when kings are accustomed to enter upon their warlike expeditions after the winter's rest. As we have no similar notice of the time in the 19th chapter, we may safely assume that all the wars referred to there occurred in the course of the previous year.—*And Joab led forth the power of the army;* more precisely in 2 Sam. xi., "*David sent Joab and his servants with him and all Israel;*" the expression חֵיל הַצָּבָא, which we only meet with here, like the similar words in 2 Chr. xxvi. 13, must denote the whole army, all the men who were capable of bearing arms.—*And he devastated the land of the sons of Ammon;* in 2 Sam. xi. 1 the word "land" is wanting, but it should be inserted in the text, since the land of the sons of Ammon is distinguished from the capital of the land, Rabbah, the siege of which is mentioned immediately afterwards. *David remained in Jerusalem;* he afterwards followed the army to Rabbah and returned with it to Jerusalem (v. 3). We are not informed here how it happened that David was personally engaged in the battle after all, and the account contained in this chapter would be unintelligible were it not that we can complete it from 2 Sam. xii. 26 sqq. We learn there that Joab had taken the royal city, *i.e.*, the capital. This city was composed of two distinct parts, the water-city, or the part which was built in the valley on the banks of the small river, which is now called the Nahr Amman, and the portion which was fortified. In order that David might have the honour of conquering the latter, as soon as Joab had taken the water-city he sent for David to come and besiege the city (*i.e.*, the fortress), and take it; and David went as was requested. The author of the Chronicles passes over all this, and contents himself with the brief notice, "*Joab smote Rabbah and destroyed it.*" It is not easy to reconcile the statement in

2 Sam. xii. 26 to the effect that Joab took the city with that in vv. 27, 28, where David himself is said to have taken it. Nor do I think the two passages can be successfully harmonised, except by assuming that *the royal city* mentioned in v. 26 was that part of the city which is called *the water-city* in v. 27. When this portion of the city had been taken and destroyed, the fortress, which Joab sent for David to reduce, could not possibly hold out long. So much, however, is certain, that the author of the Chronicles must have been fully acquainted with the whole narrative as contained in 2 Sam. xii. 26 sqq., for otherwise the two statements, "*David remained in Jerusalem*" (v. 1) and "*David and all the people returned to Jerusalem*" (v. 3), would be quite unintelligible.—V. 2. *And in it were precious stones;* this reading should also be substituted in Samuel for "*with the precious stones.*"—V. 3. וישר from the root ישר, which only occurs here; the meaning to *cut* or *saw in pieces* is established by the word מַשּׂוֹר a saw from the root נשר.—ובמגרות must be altered into ובמגזרות (a kind of *scythe*) according to 2 Sam., מגרה having been mentioned just before. Another fearful kind of punishment is spoken of in 2 Sam.: *he threw them into brick kilns.* Compare with this the severe punishment inflicted upon Moab, 2 Sam. viii. 2; and Amos i. 3; Prov. xx. 26.

Chap. xx. 4—8. cf. 2 Sam. xxi. 18—22. In 2 Sam. xxi. 15—22 we have very brief notices of victories gained by Israelitish heroes over giants in the land of the Philistines. It is probable that these notices were placed at the end of works containing the history of the wars of David. This would account for the fact, that in the second book of Samuel they form a loosely connected appendix at the close of the history of David, and in the Chronicles are inserted here at the end of the account of David's wars. In Samuel four heroes are named, who gained renown through their conflicts with Philistian giants; in the passage before us only three are mentioned. We cannot tell for what reason the historian has omitted the short account of the attack made upon David by the giant Ishbi-benob, who was slain by Abishai the son of Zeruiah (1 Sam. xxi. 15—17).—V. 4. *After this;* the same formula occurs in 2 Sam. xxi. 18, and there it connects the verse with the brief account of the conflict of David and Abishai with the giant Ishbi-benob. In the present instance the con-

junctive formula is still retained, although the event, to which it refers, is not mentioned at all, a clear proof of the loose manner in which it is used, and that it is of little worth in a chronological point of view, cf. chap xix. 1.—ותעמד probably arose from the corresponding words ותהי עוד in 2 Sam.; the expression *there stood a war* for "*a war arose*" occurs, so far as I am aware, in this passage alone.—*At Gezer;* cf. chap. vii. 28 seq. The name *Gob* in 2 Sam. should probably be altered into Gezer (cf. *Thenius*). *Sibbekai the Chushathite* was one of the Gibborim, as we learn from chap. xi. 29 compared with xxvii. 11.—*The children of Rapha* or the Rephaim in the land of the Philistines were a remnant of the aborigines. In the land of the Philistines the aborigines were called *Avvim;* they had been conquered by the Philistines who migrated from Caphtor (Deut. ii. 23). Certain families continued to live there under Philistine rule (cf. Josh. xi. 22), and from them the giants, mentioned in these verses, were descended. *And they* (the Philistines) *were humbled* (Judg. xi. 33; 1 Sam. vii. 13); these words are wanting in Samuel.—V. 5. The place where the conflict occurred is not named here, but in Samuel it is said to have happened בגוב (in Gob) probably the place called גֹּב in the previous verse. In this verse also Gezer is most likely the true reading, in fact the resemblance to Gezer is greater in the latter instance than in the former.—*Elchanan;* not the Elchanan mentioned in chap. xi. 26.—The Keri *Ben-Jair* lies at the foundation of the present reading of the text of Samuel (*Jaare-oregim*). It is now generally admitted that יערי is יעיר with the letters transposed, and that the *oregim* has been taken by mistake from the following clause.—The concluding words of this verse differ very widely from 2 Sam., but it is at once apparent that however different the readings are now, the text was originally the same, for the letters of the words את־לחמי אחי in this passage and בית הלחמי את are very nearly alike. According to the reading of our text, which *Thenius* and many of the earlier scholars regard as the original, Elchanan the son of Jair slew Lachmi the brother of Goliath of Gath; according to the Book of Samuel Elchanan the son of Jair of Bethlehem slew Goliath of Gath. We are of opinion that the latter is the original account, for we can understand the growth of our reading out of that in Samuel, but cannot see how

the former could give rise to the latter. To a reader acquainted with the account of David's conflict with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii.) it could not but appear strange to meet with the statement here that Elchanan slew a giant Goliath, and we may certainly assume that no reader in ancient times would put such an explanation upon an illegibly written text. ("Nearly all the commentators, *e.g.*, *Clericus*, *J. H. and J. D. Michaelis*, *Dereser* and others, consider the text of Samuel to be corrupt, and correct it from that of the Chronicles." *Keil* p. 297.)—V. 6. אִישׁ מָדָה is generally regarded as a substitute for the *Kethib* of 2 Sam. אִישׁ מִדִּין, *middin* being taken as the plural of *mad* with the termination *in*; but *mad* does not mean *mensura* (cf. *Hitzig* on Jer. xiii. 25). In the place of the *Keri*, *madon (length)*, the common word *middah* is used in this passage. *And his fingers and toes were six each, together four and twenty*; in 2 Sam. the account is more elaborate, but our brief description is sufficiently clear. V. 8. אֵל, an abbreviation of אֱלֹהִים; it only occurs nine times in the Old Testament, viz., in this passage without the article and eight times in the Pentateuch with the article. Its occurrence is therefore very striking here, for it is found nowhere else in the books of the Chronicles. The original reading we find in Samuel אֵלֶּה יֻלַּד (the numeral *four* attached to these words was necessarily omitted here, as the previous accounts mention only *three* children of Rapha and not *four* as in 2 Sam. xxi.); from this, the *He* having become illegible, אֵל נוֹלָדוּ was formed, with a reference to chap. iii. 5; the *o* of the Niphal is here shortened into *u* and after the *U* vowel the Lamed is double (see the similar treatment of the Hophal in Ezek. xvi. 4, 5, and Gen. xl. 20): *And they fell by the hands of David and his servants*; this conclusion is also found in 2 Sam. xxi. 22. In the latter passage it more evidently suits the context, for there is at least one account of a conflict between David and a son of Rapha, viz., that with Ishbi Benob (v. 15—17), but the three sons of Rapha, who are mentioned here, were slain by Sibbekai, Elchanan and Jonathan.

Chap. xxi. 1—27. cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. *The numbering of the people and the pestilence.*—V. 1. The commencement of this section in 2 Sam. ("and *again* the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel") refers to the history of the famine, the first national plague

in David's reign (chap. xxi. 1—14), which is not recorded in the Chronicles. For this reason the section before us necessarily has a somewhat different commencement. That which is represented in 2 Sam. as the immediate effect of the wrath of God is here produced by the intervention of Satan, who remains subject to him and does not act by his own power. This *Satan stood up against Israel* to accuse the people before God and to bring calamity and punishment from him upon the nation. The result of his rising up against Israel was an attempt to establish his charge against the king, for the sin of the king would be sufficient to induce God to inflict suffering upon the people, in which the chastising hand of God would at the same time reach the king. Hence it is said "*and he provoked David* (precisely the same word is used in 2 Sam. where the subject is Jehovah, only בָּהֶם is added there, so that the meaning is: Jehovah provoked David against them, viz., against the Israelites, *i.e.*, he impelled him to perform an action which should prove injurious to the Israelites (cf. Jer. xliii. 3; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Job. ii. 3) *to number Israel*," and David numbered the people and thus gave occasion to God to visit the people with a great plague, of which a description is given in the following verses. But in what way could the numbering of the people be regarded as a crime on the part of David? In the time of Moses the people had been numbered and God was not angry then. But on the occasion of that numbering the Israelites had each contributed half a shekel towards the building of the tabernacle, "that there might be no plague among them when (Moses) numbered them" (Ex. xxx. 11—16). Hence the numbering of the people in itself was regarded as an undertaking, by which the anger of God could be easily aroused, but when the arrangements were made by Moses for the taking of the census, God was not angry, because the people were numbered for the express purpose of the tax for the sanctuary, and the money which was thus collected ("the atonement money," Ex. xxx. 16) appeased him; compare the expiatory sacrifices of the Romans on the occasion of the census. Everything depends therefore upon the design of the census. As nothing is said respecting the design of the census instituted by David, we must endeavour to determine it by more general considerations. *Thenius* observes that in the author's view the sin

lay in the fact that David was prompted by pride, and a desire to set before his own eyes the greatness of his glory and power. This view is chiefly sustained by the words of Joab (*v.* 3); but the whole connection requires a more precise explanation of this presumptuous act. Others are of opinion that David had the people numbered that he might know the number of his warriors and arrange the order of military service; but, although this may certainly have been taken into account, since the number of those who were fit for war is given in v. 5 seq. and it was important to know the number before the army could be organised,—the census itself and the muster-rolls founded upon it were principally intended to facilitate the levy of the taxes which had been rendered necessary by the monarchical government, just as the census described in Ex. xxx. was taken for the sake of taxation. The free congregation had hitherto known nothing of fixed taxes for the state; but a monarchy could not exist without them. The people might cry out, as Samuel had foretold, when the king demanded taxes of them like the kings of other nations, and might see in this new scheme of David an encroachment upon the liberty of the people, an arbitrary alteration of ancient customs, an injustice, an oppression, a tyranny, which were unbecoming in a king of Israel. And it was quite in harmony with the customs of those times, that the guardians of the distinctive institutions of Israel, the prophets, should loudly condemn this new device, as Nathan had expressed disapprobation of David's plan of erecting a temple in the place of the moveable sanctuary (1 Chr. xvii.), and threatened David with punishment from God. David himself acknowledged that he had done wrong, and desisted from his undertaking (1 Chr. xxvii. 24). But the people were visited by a pestilence, in which was seen the chastising hand of God. V. 2. And David said *to Joab and to the prince of the people* (2 Sam.: *to Joab the captain of the host which was with him)*; the original reading was probably *to Joab and to princes of the army who were with him* (cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 4). The rare word שׁוּט *to traverse* (in the Chronicles this root is only met with in the emphatic form in 2. xvi. 9) and פָּקַד to *take a census*, which are used in 2 Sam., are exchanged by our historian for the more common לִבְנוֹ סִפְרוּ.—V. 3. In 2 Sam. we find this verse in its original extremely peculiar form as follows:

and may Jehovah thy God add to the people as many as there are of them (כהם *just as they*, the Israelites, *are)*; the word is used here with reference to their number, and therefore with the meaning, as many as there are of them. Grammatically considered כהם is the accusative of the object governed by ויוסף, see the similar passages in Deut. i. 11; Ex. xi. 6; 2 Sam. xii. 8; and also the note on 2 Chr. ix. 11), *and as many as there are of them a hundred times, the eyes of the king seeing* (this increase of the people), *and my lord the king wherefore is he pleased with this thing?* Joab wishes the king to reign over twice as many subjects, or rather over a hundred times as many, and adds expressly his wish, that this increase should take place during the life time of David (thine eyes seeing) that he might rejoice in his numerous subjects. Hence, when he adds, "*wherefore is my lord pleased with this thing,*" and thus expresses his disapprobation of the measures adopted for the numbering of the people, he is not actuated by the desire to conceal from the king the large number of his subjects. The reading in our text is very different from that of Samuel; the important climax contained in the repetition of the words כהם וכהם is not expressed; the extremely peculiar and thoroughly suitable words ועיני אדני המלך ראות (and the eyes of my lord the king seeing) are altered, and in my opinion not intentionally but as the result of conjecture from an illegible text, for the letters of the words of our text הלא אדני המלך כלם לאדני לעבדים do not differ very considerably from those of the corresponding words in Samuel ועיני אדני המלך ראות ואדני המלך.—V. 4. The manner in which the census was taken is fully described in 2 Sam xxiv. 4—8, where it is also stated that Joab took nine months and twenty days to complete it. Our historian merely relates in a few words that the numbering was performed, and condenses into one verse the contents of five.—V. 5. The numbers given in the two texts differ; according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 9 there were 800,000 men in Israel and 500,000 in Judah capable of bearing arms, but in the Chronicles there are said to have been 1,100,000 in Israel and 470,000 in Judah. As the numbers are reckoned by thousands they are only approximative. The reliance to be placed upon them is still farther diminished by the dis-

crepancies. Moreover they do not appear to harmonise well with the statement contained in chap. xxvii. 1—15 of this book (that David appointed 24,000 men for service in each month under twelve different commanders), as this statement presupposes the existence of about 300,000 capable of bearing arms. But every attempt to reconcile the different accounts must necessarily rest upon arbitrary assumptions. All that can be inferred from the greatness of the numbers is, that the inhabitants of Palestine were extraordinarily numerous as early as David's time; we have most clear and credible testimony to the fact that in later times the population of this small country was incredibly large (see my Beiträge zur Gesch. der Israeliten p. 431 seq. *v. Raumer* Pal. ed. 2 p. 81).—V. 6. The account given in this verse, that Joab did not take any census in the case of the tribes of Levi and Benjamin, because the command of the king was an abomination to him, is not found in 2 Sam. *Gramberg* pretends that the historian invented it, for the purpose of showing that these tribes were not affected by the pestilence because they had not been numbered (according to verse 12 and 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 the pestilence raged throughout all the land, and Jerusalem alone was spared; nothing is said about Levi and Benjamin escaping), but such an assertion does not merit the elaborate answer which *Movers* has given to it (p. 305). There is nothing surprising in the statement contained in this verse. If the object of the census was to facilitate taxation, the sacerdotal tribe may have been exempted on account of their privileged position, just as we find them omitted in Num. i. 47, 48—54; and apart altogether from this, all that can be inferred from the fact that two tribes had not been numbered is, that the census was not complete, and this is expressly stated at chap. xxvii. 33 seq. From the account of the manner in which the census was taken (2 Sam. xxiv. 4—8) we may conclude that Judah and Benjamin were to have been numbered after the rest of the tribes; that after the census of Judah had been taken Joab had to go to Jerusalem; there he had most probably received orders from David, who had now changed his mind, to proceed no farther with the census, and thus it happened that Benjamin was not numbered along with the rest; cf. *Josephus*, Antiquities vii. 13. 1 *χωρὶς τῆς Βενιαμίτιδος φυλῆς, ἐξαριθμῆσαι γὰρ αὐτὴν οὐκ ἔφθασεν.*

We are not justified in regarding the account given in this verse as "an invention of the historian," nor does the omission of it from 2 Samuel disprove its credibility, for there are other notices in this narrative which are not found in Samuel, *e.g.* vv. 20, 23. V. 7. *And it was evil in the eyes of Jehovah concerning this thing;* the construction with עַל occurs in Gen. xxi. 12; in other cases the cause of the displeasure is placed after the verb without the preposition, *e.g.* 2 Sam. xi. 27; Gen. xxxviii. 10. The concluding words, *therefore he smote Israel,* anticipate what is narrated afterwards (v. 9 sqq.), and thus interrupt the course of the history. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 10 we find, instead of this clause, the very peculiar words "*and David's heart smote him*" (cf. 1 Sam. xxiv. 6). We can easily understand, how the words of the one clause could be altered into those of the other by any one who started with the assumption, that the passage contained a reference to the punishments inflicted by God. The first clause would probably be added to introduce and account for the second, as well as to connect it with the rest of the narrative. V. 8. *This thing;* an explanatory addition which there is no necessity to insert in the text of Samuel, as the sentence is complete without it. V. 9. *And the Lord spake to Gad;* as this is the first time that Gad is spoken of, the reading of Samuel, which indicates the change in the discourse *(and the word of Jehovah came to Gad),* is preferable. *David's seer;* Heman is also called a prophet of the king (chap. xxv. 5), and therefore it must not be inferred from the title that Gad stood in such peculiar proximity to David, that the duty of reproving the king fell to him on account of his position more than to Nathan or any other of the prophets. V. 11. נטה (for the rarer word נטל in 2 Sam.) *I spread out above thee.* V. 11. *Thus saith Jehovah, choose thee;* an explanatory clause of which our historian is the author, as the use of the word קבל clearly shows. V. 12. The demand "*choose thee*" is followed by a somewhat different form of the question contained in Samuel. In the first query, *three years of famine? three* is the correct reading and not *seven,* which we find in the passage in Sam. (although the Septuagint reads *three* in that passage also.) To the *three* evils there correspond *three* years, *three* months, *three* days, and this beautiful agreement in the numbers is completely destroyed by the reading *seven.* In

the second question נָסָךְ (2 Sam.) is the original reading; נִסְפֶּה probably crept into the text of the Chronicles through an oversight, from the illegibility of the text, for the particle Niphal does not suit the connection, since it can hardly mean *destruction*, and מִפְּנֵי (2 Sam. לִפְנֵי) does not harmonise with this participle. *The sword of thine enemies overtaketh*; the word מַשֹּׂגֶת is a very rare word (it only occurs once in the Old Testament, viz: Lev. xiv. 21), but it is a word which answers very well to רִדָּפְךָ (2 Sam.), and רדף למשגת means *to pursue until one overtakes*. We conclude, therefore, that the original reading was והוא רדפך למשגת, but the first words have been altered in our text, from what cause we cannot tell. The third question appears to have been written originally in the form in which we find it in the text of the Chronicles, "*or the sword of Jehovah and pestilence for three days in thy land?*" The last words, "*the angel of Jehovah working destruction in the whole of the territory of Israel,*" might be regarded as an interpolation taken from v. 15, as there is no trace of this clause in Samuel; but they prepare the way for the sending of the angel, who is introduced in 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 quite suddenly and unexpectedly, and hence they are so necessary to elucidate the rest of the narrative, that they cannot well be dispensed with. In our opinion, therefore, they originally formed part of the text of Samuel also. *Now see* (more forcibly expressed in Samuel, *now mark and see* ועתה דע וראה); after ועתה the דע may easily have been dropt on account of the resemblance between the words. *What answer I shall bring to my sender*, to God who said to me: "*go and tell David, &c.*" (v. 10). V. 13. *Let me fall* (instead of the reading in Samuel, "let us fall now"); corresponding to the expression which follows, "*let me not fall.*" V. 14. For the sake of brevity the account of the duration of the pestilence and the extent of its ravages, which we find in Samuel, is omitted here. V. 15. וישלח האלהים מלאך (2 Sam. וישלח ידו מלאך); *Movers* (p. 91) argues in favour of the originality of the text of the Chronicles, but *Thenius* justly remarks that ידו is the most appropriate reading, since the counter-order "*draw back thine hand,*" points back to the commencement of the verse "*he stretched out his hand.*" The meaning is evidently this: as soon as the angel of God, who

had been commissioned to destroy the whole land by pestilence, approached the city of Jerusalem and stretched out his hand toward it, to smite the city with the sword which was drawn in his hand, the Lord repented of the evil and called to him "draw back thy hand." According to our text the Lord sent the angel with the express commission to destroy Jerusalem, and at the same moment gave him a counter-order, in which there certainly appears to be less propriety. Our reading *Elohim* has arisen from the fact that the letters of יהו ה were mistaken for יהוה, for which Elohim was then substituted as it frequently is in the Chronicles. *And at the time of the destroying*, at the moment in which the angel commenced the work of destruction, *Jehovah saw*; these words, which are intended to soften the harshness of the transition from the command to the countermand, are omitted from Samuel, where they would be superfluous. רַב has been regarded as an exclamation, *sufficit, hold, enough!* That this meaning suits the word cannot be proved by an appeal to Deut. vi. 1; in this connection it can only be an adjective or noun, and must be taken along with the verb *to destroy*, as the accusative of the object: *he said to the angel who was about to destroy a multitude*; the full reading is preserved in Sam. בעם רב, who was about to bring destruction upon a great multitude of people, cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 17. *Ornan*, in the Kethib of 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 אוֹרְנָה; in every other passage, with the exception of v. 19, the Keri is found אַרַוְנָה (vv. 20, 21 sqq.). The latter form has not a Hebrew stamp, but Orna and Ornan are both Hebrew forms. For this very reason, however, the name Aravnah appears to point to an early tradition. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 23 this Aravnah is called *King*, and if we could attach much importance to the reading (the word is probably an interpolation) we should necessarily infer that he was the former king of Jebus, who retained his property, and continued to live there even after the conquest of the city by David. He is not called king anywhere else. On the hill to the north-east of Zion, subsequently the temple-hill, he had a threshing-floor, and according to v. 20 he was busy, threshing wheat there at this time (a somewhat different account is given in 2 Sam.).—V. 16. This verse does not form part of the narra-

tive in Samuel. As here David and the elders of the people are overpowered by the vision of the angel, and fall to the earth, so in v. 20 are Ornan and his four sons said to have concealed themselves, because they could not bear the sight. But we shall see that the words in question in v. 20 did not originally form part of the text; and this confirms the supposition to which we are led on comparing the verse with the account in Samuel, viz. that it was added by our historian to the original record. We have no further confirmation of this in the language employed; the expression מְגָפִים בשקים is only met with here (in every other case the Hithpael is employed, *cf.* 2 Kings xix. 1, 2, and the parallel passages in Isaiah, Jonah iii. 8); the rest of the words are nearly all of them so common that they might be found in every book of the Old Testament.—*And his sword drawn in his hand*, this expression occurs in Num. xxii. 23 in precisely the same form, and was probably taken from that passage.—In any case this account of the appearance of the angel is only an expansion of the corresponding account in Samuel, for there it is stated clearly enough that the threshing floor of Aravnah was set apart as a holy place, because the angel was standing near it, and was seen. According to 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, David saw the angel, and the context shows that the reference there is to a visible appearance of the angel.—V. 17. *Was it not I that commanded to number the people* (2 Sam. xxiv. 17, *when he saw the angel that smote the people)*; from a comparison of the words and letters of the Hebrew text of these two passages it is evident that the reading of the one has originated in that of the other; and it is pretty clear that from oversight and from an endeavour to restore a text, which had become illegible, the words of the verse before us have grown out of that in Samuel. Among the other variations the following is an important one: in 2 Sam. we find הרע הרעותי for העויתי. The original reading was probably ואנכי הָרֹעֶה העויתי, *and I the shepherd have acted perversely*, for the reading of our text could easily be formed from these words, and the reference to the shepherd would be quite appropriate as an antithesis to the sheep mentioned directly after.—*And on thy people not for a plague;* the order of these words is striking, we should expect them rather to run thus, "*on*

me, and on my house, but not on the people for a plague," for this order seems requisite to give due prominence to the contrast intended. It is possible that in these words, of which no trace appears in Samuel, we may have two marginal notes, which have crept from the margin into the text: "*for a plague,*" was possibly written in the margin to explain, "*let thy hand be,*" and "*not on thy people*" may have been added as an explanation of the words "*on me and on my father's house.*"—V. 18. The angel of Jehovah told Gad *to say* (this is the only admissible explanation of לאמר here) *to David.* That the prophet received instructions from the angel is quite in keeping with the whole of the narrative. But it is only in books of a late period that we read of angels speaking to prophets in such a way as to form the medium of communication between God and the prophets addressed. In 2 Sam. Gad is described as going direct to David, and giving him the command to build an altar; but as the command came from the mouth of a prophet, David could not doubt that it was given in the name of God. The command itself is also given there in the words of a direct address.—V. 19. *At the saying;* or *according to the saying,* as we find it in Samuel. *Which he spake in the name of the Lord* (2 Sam. "*as the Lord commanded*"); the reading of the text is adopted here because the command is not described as coming direct from Jehovah.—V. 20. *And Ornan returned back;* it is difficult to discover to what these words refer. They do not suit the thread of the narrative, which is very distinctly preserved in Samuel, where we read that "when the king, who came with his retinue in a solemn procession from Mount Zion, ascended to the threshing floor of Ornan, and Ornan saw him approaching, he looked up from his work, and fixed his eyes upon the king," &c. In the passage before us וישב has grown out of וישקף, המלאך from המלך (the latter reading has been retained even by *Josephus,* vii. 13, 4, who in every other respect follows the text as we have it now) and our ארבעת בניו עמו from עבדיו עברים עליו. Probably *King* (2 Sam. xxiv. 20) was first changed into *angel;* this change rendered a further alteration of the text necessary, and the occurrence of the word angel in connexion with the name of Ornan may have suggested the thought that the passage contained a reference to the impres-

sion made upon him by the vision which he saw. In the Septuagint this passage is rendered: *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν Ὀρνά, καὶ εἶδε τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τέσσαρας υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ μεθ' ἁρπαβίν*, according to another reading *καὶ τέσσαρες υἱοὶ κρυβομένοι*; in the *Vulgate: porro Ornan cum suspexisset* (וישקף 2 Sam.) *et vidisset angelum quatuorque filii ejus cum eo, absconderunt se*; in both versions some remains of the original reading are to be found. The *Syriac* renders the passage thus: "And David saw that the angel, who was about to bring destruction upon the people, drew back his hand." The concluding words "*now Ornan was threshing wheat*," contain a most satisfactory explanation of the reason why Ornan was in his threshing floor; they do not occur in Samuel, but in the Septuagint we find instead a remark at v. 15 to the effect that "the pestilence happened at the time of the wheat-harvest!" If we assume that Joab commenced the census in the quiet season of autumn, *i.e.* at the beginning of the civil year (Ex. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22), the nine months and twenty days mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiv. 8, would extend to the time of the wheat harvest (*Ewald* Gesch. ii. 628): and hence the announcement that Ornan was engaged in threshing wheat is shown to have been already provided for by the previous account, and was probably taken by our historian from the original document which lay before him.—V. 21. On account of the present text of the previous verse it is stated here that, when David approached, Ornan looked and saw him; only the concluding words of the verse correspond to the last clause of 2 Sam. xxiv. 20.—V. 22. A comparison of this verse with 2 Sam. xxiv. 21 suggests the probability that the present reading of our text has been effected by Gen. xxiii. 9, where בכסף מלא and the verb נתן occur twice, just as in this verse, and in precisely the same order.—V. 23. *Let my lord the king do*; the original reading is *let him offer* (*Thenius*). After *the threshing instruments* there are added in Samuel the *instruments of the oxen*, meaning *the wooden yokes of the oxen*. Ornan offers to David the oxen, which were threshing the corn at the time, and also the threshing instruments and yokes, the latter because, being composed of small pieces of wood, they would facilitate the kindling of the fire. In order that everything which was requisite for the burnt-offering might be at hand, he offers him

also *the wheat as a gift*, of which no mention is made in Samuel. The words "*I give it all*" answer to the first clause of 2 Sam. xxiv. 23, "*all this did Araunah give;*" of the rest of that verse there is no trace in our text.—V. 24. *For I will not take what belongs to thee for Jehovah, and offer a burnt-offering obtained for nothing!* The infinitive העלות in this passage is very remarkable; the only possible way of explaining it would be to regard the clause as an incomplete exclamation, viz.: "and to offer a burnt-offering that cost nothing (*sc.* how could I do it!)" But if we compare this word with עלית and the rest of the clause in 2 Sam., it appears very probable that the original reading was: *I will not take what belongs to thee* (viz., the floor and land which are thy property) and will not offer, &c.—V. 25. After the words of David in the previous verse we expect to find that he purchased not only the ground but also *the cattle*, and this he is said to have done in Samuel, where he is described as giving fifty shekels of silver for the floor and the oxen. According to our text he paid *shekels of gold in weight six hundred.* To reconcile the two accounts ancient scholars (*e.g. Noldius* ad concord. Part. Not. 719) have expressed the opinion that the shekels of gold mentioned here are to be reckoned as silver ones, that they are called shekels of gold because they were paid in gold coin, whilst the amount actually paid was 600 shekels of silver, that gold was worth twelve times as much as silver, and therefore David paid fifty gold coins, which are the fifty pieces mentioned in Samuel. *R. Salomon* supposes that the twelve tribes contributed fifty shekels each, and thus the whole amount collected was 600 shekels. Other opinions equally marvellous have been expressed on this subject. The two accounts cannot be reconciled. (*Keil* arrives at a very different conclusion: he says (p. 326) "in 1 Chr. xxi. 25 it is stated that David gave to Ornan for the *place* (probably the hill, Mount Moriah) 600 shekels of gold. On the other hand in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24 we read that David bought the *threshing-floor and the oxen* for fifty shekels of silver. The very words of the two passages show that the authors were writing of different things, and therefore there is no reason to suppose that there is any error." TR.)—*And he hearkened to him with fire from heaven upon the burnt offering, i.e.*, he shewed that he had determined to deliver the land from the pestilence, and also

that the sacrifice, which had been offered upon the newly erected altar and the new place of sacrifice, was acceptable to him, by sending fire from heaven, and thus kindling the wood upon the altar of burnt-offering, *cf.* 2 Kings i. 12; 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38; 2 Chr. vii. 1; and particularly Lev. ix. 24.—V. 27. A description in perfect keeping with the whole tenor of the narrative (*cf.* v. 16), corresponding to the words of 2 Sam. xxi. 25, "the plague was stayed from Israel."

Chap. xxi. 28—xxii. 19. David was not permitted to build the temple himself (cf. chap. xvii.); but the spot upon which it should afterwards be built, within the city which he had conquered and selected as the central-point of the Israelitish community, was set apart during his lifetime and consecrated by signs from God himself. He also made preparations for the building of the temple by collecting materials, so that Solomon was able at once to set about the erection of the new sanctuary, and to complete it during the first years of his reign.

Chap. xxi. 28—xxii. 1. The account of the numbering of the people, the pestilence and the appearance of the angel, is brought to a close in these verses. This conclusion is not to be found in the Book of Samuel, although it is evident, from the connection between the narrative and the whole of the history of David and Solomon in the Books of Samuel and Kings, that the only reason for its introduction is to show that the place upon which Solomon built the temple was holy ground even in David's time, and to answer the question why this spot in particular was selected for the sanctuary.—V. 28. *At that time, after the cessation of the pestilence, when David saw that Jehovah had heard him upon the threshing floor of the Jebusites, he sacrificed there.* According to the previous account, David offered the sacrifice during the pestilence, and the cessation of the pestilence is represented as the consequence of the sacrifice, which was accepted as well-pleasing to God (vv. 26, 27). It is to this that the expression "*he had heard*" in the verse before us refers; and therefore the words "*and he sacrificed*," relate to the continuance of the practice of offering sacrifices at this place, which had been first used as a place of sacrifice during the pestilence. We might give this rendering to the clause: "*then David was in the habit of sacrificing there.*" —Vv. 29, 30. We have here a parenthesis, intended as a reply

to the question, how it was that David came to offer sacrifices at this new place of sacrifice, and on the new altar of burnt-offering, which he had erected there, notwithstanding the fact that the old Mosaic sanctuary, the central point of the worship of the Israelitish community ever since the time of Moses, was still standing upon the high places of Gibeon (cf. chap. xvi. 39 seq.). *David could not go before it* (the expression "*before it*" refers to the tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering which are mentioned just before; cf. chap. xvi. 4, 37: "before the ark," and xvi. 39: "before the tabernacle") *to seek God, i.e.*, to obtain the favour of God especially by the offering of sacrifices (cf. 2 Chr. i. 5 seq.), *for he had been afraid of the sword of the angel of Jehovah* (vv. 16, 27), not "ex terrore visionis angelicae infirmitatem corporis contraxerat" (*J. H. Michaelis*), but he had been affected, and, as it were, overcome by the distinct intimation from God that the place, where the angel had appeared, was a holy place, which God himself had consecrated for the offering of sacrifices, and therefore he did not dare to offer them elsewhere. —Chap. xxii. 1. Continuation of the narrative which was interrupted at v. 28 by the introduction of the parenthesis. The place, where the sanctuary was to be built, is described by David as *the house of God* (cf. Gen. xxviii. 17).

3. Chap. xxii. 2—19.

David's preparations for the building of the temple.

Chap. xxii. 2—5. *Collection of building-materials.*—*The strangers:* that is, those who were not Israelites by birth but lived in Israel as members of the community; their number in Solomon's time is given at 2 Chr. ii. 16, 17. According to 2 Chr. viii. 7—10 these foreigners consisted of descendants of the Canaanites, whom the Israelites had failed to exterminate when they conquered the land. (cf. 1 Kings v. 27—31, ix. 15—23.) —V. 3. מחברות, the Piel participle, *binding things;* according to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 11 they were pieces of wood used to connect the beams, but in this passage they are *iron brackets.*—V. 4. The *Zidonians and Tyrians* are classed together in the same way

in Ezra iii. 7. The meaning appears to be, that they brought to David an abundance of cedar wood as an article of commerce. In Solomon's time the Tyrians bound themselves by a formal contract to supply the cedar wood required (1 Kings v. 15—25.) —V. 5. *Young and tender;* the same expression occurs in chap. xxix. 1. We cannot draw any conclusion from these words as to the age of Solomon at this time, for Joshua is described in Ex. xxxiii. 11 as still a boy in relation to Moses, although it is evident from the chronological data given in the Pentateuch that he was more than forty years old. They show, however, the father's anxiety lest the powers of his youthful son should be inadequate to the great task which he left for him to perform; and hence in contrast with the son, who is young and tender, he says, "*the house, which is to be built for Jehovah, is very great to make* (on the Infinitive in this connexion see chap. v. 1, ix. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 2, on לְמַעֲלָה see chap. xiv. 2) *for a name, namely for renown and for glory with reference to all lands*" (chap. xiv. 17); (and in order that the disparity between the two may be softened down he resolves) "*I will make preparations for him.*"

Vv. 6—16. *In a solemn manner David gives to Solomon the commission to build the temple.*—V. 6. As the following address sounds like the last charge of a dying father, and as it strongly recals to mind, at least in some of the expressions, the address contained in 1 Kings ii. 2—9, which is said in v. 1 to have been delivered by David a short time before his death, and as reference is made to his death in the previous verse, the meaning of the verse before us evidently is, that David called Solomon to him a short time before his decease, that he might give him instructions with reference to the building of the temple.—V. 7. According to the accents the reading of the *Keri* should be adopted, and in this case the address would begin with the vocative *my son!* But the commencement of the address is distinctly marked by the first person pronoun, and therefore the Kethib (*his son*) must be retained and the accents changed so as to read: *he said to Solomon his son. I, it was in my heart,* in other words I intended; we find almost exactly the same expression in chap. xxviii. 2, 2 Chr. vi. 7, 8, and many other passages in the second Book of Chronicles i. 11, ix. 1, xxiv. 4, xxix. 10, but it very rarely occurs in the other books of the Old Testament, *e.g.*, 1 Kings

viii. 17 seq.—The verse points back to chap. xvii. 1 seq.—V. 8. According to the will of God the building of the temple was not to be entrusted to the warlike king David, but to his son, who was to be permitted to live at peace. This historical fact is again referred to in chap. xxviii. 3, and 1 Kings v. 17, though not in the same terms as in this verse. It is recorded here in the form of a command, which was given by God to David ("And the word of the Lord came to me"). We must bear in mind that in Nathan's address (chap. xvii. 4—14) the prosperous wars of David are mentioned, but it is not stated that these wars unfitted him to build the temple. *Before me* thou hast shed much blood upon the earth, that is, so that I looked upon it.—V. 9. *A son will be born to thee;* the participle is also used in this sense after the exclamation *behold!* in 1 Kings xiii. 2. Compare v. 19 of this chapter.—*A man of rest,* like Jer. li. 59 and Ps. xxiii. 2: "*waters of rest,*" must denote the man who procures rest for others; from the antithesis *a man of war* (1 Chr. xxviii. 3) and the context of this passage, the word *menochah* evidently means *rest,* and Solomon is called *a man of rest,* because he was to enjoy the blessings of peace.—*And I will give him rest,* cf. 1 Kings v. 18.—שְׁלֹמֹה (*Solomon*); according to this passage the name has the same meaning as *Friederich,* but from the relation in which it stands to the peace enjoyed by the land during his reign, we are not to infer that the name was first given to Solomon in consequence of the peace which had been established in his days. The writer regards it as a most significant omen. The other name, Jedidiah was given to Solomon by Nathan, and is described in 2 Sam. xii. 24, seq. as a second and superior name, which he received in addition to the name of Solomon *on account of Jehovah, i.e.,* to express the relation in which he was to stand to Jehovah. Jedidiah was a new name expressly formed for this purpose and is not met with elsewhere, whilst Shelomo does not appear to have been an unusual name. We find names in other passages which closely resembled it, *e.g.,* *Shelomi,* Num. xxxiv. 27, *Shelomith,* Lev. xxiv. 11; 1 Chr. iii. 19, xxvi. 25; 2 Chr. xi. 20. (compare the account of the peace in Solomon's days at 1 Kings v. 4 seq.).—V. 10. A free rehearsal of the promises contained in Nathan's address (chap. xvii. 12, 13).—V. 11. *Jehovah be with thee;* xv. 16, 18.—V. 12.

Wisdom and understanding (2 Chr. ii. 11); David's wish reminds us of the account of Solomon's dream in 1 Kings iii. 5—15. ולשמר, (the infinitive with *lamed*, a construction peculiar to the author of the Chronicles,) *to keep!* that is, thou must keep, cf. v. 5.—V. 13. Both the expression "*take heed to do*" and the juxtaposition of the words, "the *statutes and judgments*," remind us of Deut. xi. 32, iv. 1, v. 1, vii. 4, &c. *Be strong and of good courage, fear not*, cf. Deut. xxxi. 6, and Josh. i. 7. "*Be not dismayed*" in connection with "*fear not*" occurs also in Deut. i. 21, xxxi. 8.—V. 14. בעניי not *in my poverty*, but *by my strenuous labour*, according to Gen. xxxi. 42; see the precisely similar expression in chap. xxix. 2, *I have prepared with all my might*. The enormous amounts given here, 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver, are not found anywhere else even in the Book of Chronicles, for in chap. xxix. 4, David is said to have contributed of his own property 3000 talents of gold and 7000 talents of silver, whilst the freewill offerings of the Israelitish princes amounted to 5000 talents of gold, 10,000 dariks and 10,000 talents of silver, immense sums no doubt, but sums which must be called small in comparison with those named in the verse before us. As a proof of the extraordinary wealth of Solomon, it is stated in 1 Kings x. 14 that his income had reached 666 talents of gold a year, *i.e.*, about twenty million thalers (three million pounds sterling, *Thenius*); the queen of Sheba presented Solomon with 120 talents of gold (1 Kings x. 10; 2 Chr. ix. 9); King Hiram gave him the same sum (1 Kings ix. 14), and according to the context of the account in the Books of Kings we are to regard this as an extraordinarily large amount. And yet in the verse before us we read of 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver, a sum almost sufficient to pay the debts of all the states of Europe.[1] It is out of the question to take these numbers in their strict literality. It may originally have been intended as nothing more than a very loose expression with the meaning *very much, an extraordinary amount:* a kind of circumlocution, which may still be sometimes heard in the mouths of persons, who have not reflected much upon the worth and import of

[1] This is an exaggeration, for according to the author's own computation just before, it would fall very far short of paying the national debt of Great Britain alone.—Tr.

numbers and, for that very reason, talk without hesitation of thousands and hundreds of thousands. This opinion is confirmed by v. 16, where it is expressly stated that the gold and silver could not be numbered. Earlier expositors have either regarded the numbers, as we find them here, as in literal accordance with fact (*undecumque autem*, says *Colovius*, *David tantam compararit summam*—3300 *Ioachimicorum millionum*—*a litera textus ob nostram ignorantiam adeo discedendum non est, ut potius mirari ac venerari oporteat benedictionem divinam hujus opilionis, quae tam immensos thesauros ipsi, ad regium thronum evecto conciliarit, etc.* *J. H. Michaelis*), or they have tried by arbitrary assumptions to reduce the amount; the latter is the method adopted even by *Keil*, p. 334 sqq.—(It may be well to supply the explanation suggested by *Keil* to which the author refers. He says: "according to 1 Chr. xxii. 14 David gives 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver for the building of the temple, and according to chap. xxix. 4 he contributes beside this 3000 talents of gold and 7000 talents of silver, to which the nobles of the kingdom add 5000 talents of gold, 10,000 dariks, 10,000 talents of silver, and a large quantity of brass and iron. The last two statements can hardly be called in question, when we consider the opportunities enjoyed by David for amassing incalculable treasures. He conquered the Edomites, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Syrians, and the powerful king of Nesibis, whose officers had golden shields (2 Sam. viii. 7). No one will deny that by these numerous wars David and the elders of his kingdom must have been able to accumulate immense wealth. Beside this the Israelitish officers under Moses took from the Midianites 16,750 shekels of gold in chains, bracelets, rings, and other ornaments, in addition to the booty that was carried off by the common soldiers (Num. xxxi. 50—53), and the weight of the rings alone, which Gideon received as a share of the plunder taken from the Ishmaelites, was 1700 shekels (Judg. viii. 26). It is true that, according to 2 Sam. viii. 11 sqq., David placed all the gold and silver, that had been taken from the tribes just named, in the treasury of the temple; but, notwithstanding this, great wealth must have flowed into his own private treasures from the kings, who either sent him valuable presents as a friend, or paid tribute as vassals. If Solomon re-

ceived 660 talents of gold annually from the allied kings and governors of the provinces (1 Kings x. 14 seq.; 2 Chr. ix. 13 seq.); besides the income derived from commerce, David, who had the same revenue in the latter part of his reign, with the exception of that derived from the trade with Ophir, which brought Solomon his extraordinary wealth, might very well possess 3000 talents of gold in his private treasury. And the treasury of the temple must have been considerably enriched by the extraordinary amount of booty. But the statement seems almost to reach the incredible. Yet not only earlier theologians, but modern expositors also (*e.g. Dereser*) have supported the historical character of the first numbers (viz., the amount in the temple-treasury); and, in fact, if the numbers in every other instance were free from error, we could and must admit their correctness in this instance also, because *every calculation, that can be based upon our money, is uncertain.* The only clue which we possess is the assertion of *Josephus* (Ant. iii. 8—2), that a shekel was equal to four Attic drachms. But there was an interval of a thousand years between Josephus and David, and, with the frequent changes in the government, there must have been great alterations in the weights and measures of the Jews. Moreover, there are many proofs that the talent was much smaller in ancient times (cf. *Michaelis de siclo ante exil. Babyl.* and his *suppl. ad lexx. hebr.* p. 364 sqq.). To this must be added the uncertainty as to the shekels by which the talents were calculated, whether they were shekels of the sanctuary or royal shekels. If, for example, the amount was computed according to the latter (and this is a possible thing), *J. D. Michaelis* reckons that it would be worth 540 million thalers (81 million pounds sterling). But even this sum could be considerably reduced, for the gold was not so fine as our sterling gold; moreover, we are not acquainted with the relative value of gold and silver in ancient times. Again this gold had not all been collected by David, but the amount named included all that had been brought into the treasury of the sanctuary by Samuel, Saul, Abner, and Joab; for, according to 1 Chr. xxvi. 28, the whole of this went into the temple-fund. We may even add still earlier contributions to the sanctuary, for there is nothing to lead to the conclusion that the treasury of the tabernacle had ever been plundered by enemies.

Whoever ponders all these reasons, will at least withhold his decision." (*Keil* Chronik. p. 334—336).—The explanatory clause כי לרב דוד could only mean, in the mouth of David: *for* (when an attempt was made to weigh it) *it was* lying *in a mass*, so that it was necessary to give up all thought of ascertaining the weight; compare the more simple expression in v. 3. *And thou mayest add thereto*; see 2 Chr. ii. "how Solomon collected stores and wood for the building of the temple." V. 15. This verse contains a reference to v. 2, where the stonemasons are spoken of, and to v. 4, which treats of the Zidonians and Tyrians who brought the cedar wood (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 7). *All manner of cunning men*; these skilful mechanics, whom David had secured for the building of Solomon's temple, are referred to in 2 Chr. ii. 6. V. 16. *Arise and be doing*; a precisely similar expression is also found in Ezra x. 4.

Vv. 17—19. *David commands the princes of Israel to assist in the building of the temple.* V. 17. *All the princes of Israel*; chap. xxiii. 2, xxviii. 1. V. 18. The omission of any intimation that the words in v. 18 seq. were spoken by David himself is of little consequence, for on the very first glance they may be recognised as David's words. Still there is something peculiar in this abrupt introduction of the words of another. We find a similar example in chap. xxiii. 4 seq. *For he hath given the inhabitants into my hand*; cf. Josh. ii. 24. *And the land is subdued*; see Josh. xviii. 1, Num. xxxii. 22, 29, where the expressions *before Jehovah*, and *before you*, or *before them*, viz. his people, also occur. V. 19. *To seek Jehovah*; the regular construction with the accusative without *lamed* is also met with in the Chronicles, *e.g.* Bk. 1. xxi. 30; Bk. 2. xvi. 12. *The ark of the covenant of Jehovah*; the ark was kept in a tent on Mount Zion during the reign of David (chap. xv. 1; 1 Chr. v. 2). To bring the ark *into the house*, the ל before בית is here again a sign of the accusative as in chap. xxv. 26; Neh. x. 35 seq. להבנות into the house *that is to be built*;

8. CHAP. XXIII.—XXVI.

DAVID MAKES SOLOMON KING. DIVISION OF THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES INTO CLASSES, AND APPOINTMENT OF THEIR DUTIES.

1. Chap. xxiii. 1. שָׂבֵעַ יָמִים; in other cases we find the adjective שְׂבַע יָמִים, or שָׂבֵעַ alone in the same sense, the former in Gen. xxxv. 29, and Job xlii. 17, the latter in Gen. xxv. 8. In this instance we have the third person perfect of Kal followed by a noun in the accusative. From this it follows that וַיַּמְלֵךְ must also be the third person perfect of the verb. *He made Solomon his son king over Israel*; this is not a passing remark to be taken up again at a future time (*e.g.* at chap. xxix. 22), but an independent statement, which is complete in itself, and forms the commencement of the account of the arrangements made by David during the last days of his life. In these few words we have the substance of the narrative contained in 1 Kings i., which could not properly be inserted at length in the Book of Chronicles, as it is closely connected with the account of the family affairs of David related in the Books of Samuel and Kings, and the plan of our historian led him to avoid such topics altogether.

2. Chap. xxiii. 2—xxvi. *a*. The number of the Levites and their occupations, chap. xxiii. 2—5. *b*. The fathers'-houses of the Levites, chap. xxiii. 6—23, with supplementary remarks, vv. 24—33. *c*. The twenty-four priestly classes, chap. xxiv. 1—19. *d*. The leaders of the classes of the Levites, chap. xxiv. 20—31. *e*. The twenty-four classes of singers, chap. xxv. *f*. The classes of the doorkeepers, chap. xxvi. 1—19. *g*. The managers of the treasures of the sanctuary, chap. xxvi. 20—28. *h*. Officers appointed for external affairs, chap. xxvi. 29—32.

(a.) Chap. xxiii. 2—5.—V. 2. Then David *assembled (sc.* in the last days of his life *cf.* chap. xxvi. 31), *all the princes of Israel; cf.* chap. xxii. 17. In chap. xxv. 1 we read that the

princes of the host assisted David in arranging the singers. The meaning is that David made the arrangements, which are afterwards described, in a solemn assembly of the princes (*i.e.* the representatives of the lay-tribes) and of the priests and Levites. According to other passages the *princes of thousands* stood immediately by the side of David (chap. xiii. 1), and the *elders of Israel* are mentioned in connection with them (chap. xv. 25).—V 3. *From thirty years and upwards;* just as, according to Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 39 sqq., the census was taken of all Levites between the ages of thirty and fifty for the service of the sanctuary (according to Num. viii. 23—26 every Levite of twenty-five years old and upward was to take his turn in the service of the tabernacle), so here the census, taken by David towards the close of his life, embraced all the Levites who were thirty years old and upward. The relation, in which this notice stands to the account contained in v. 24 of this chapter, we shall reserve for discussion when we come to that verse. "*By their polls, man by man:*" the second expression defines the first so as to prove that women and children were not included.—V. 4 seq. As soon as the number had been determined (38,000), David spoke (that these verses contain an address by David is evident from the word עשרין, in v. 5; the abrupt introduction of David's words is not more remarkable in this passage than in chap. xxii. 18 seq.), for the purpose of decreeing what number of Levites should be appointed to the different offices.—*Twenty-four thousand* of them were set apart *to conduct the work of the house of Jehovah* (for a more precise explanation of this expression see v. 28—32, and chap. ix. 13): among the different departments of this work were (1) *the service of the holy of holies,* which was committed to the priests (chap. vi. 49), who were divided into twenty-four classes, as described immediately afterwards at chap. xxiv.; (2) the "*work of the service,*" which is said in chap. ix. 19 to have been committed to the *four thousand doorkeepers;* (3) the "*outward business*" mentioned in chap. xxvi. 29, which was allotted to the *six thousand scribes and judges;* (4) *the work of the singers* (chap. xxv. 1), of the four thousand singers, *who praise Jehovah with the instruments, which I have made for praising;* cf. Nehem. xii. 36, the instruments of David the man of God, by which the stringed instruments especially are meant, 2 Ch. xxix.

26; there is also a passage in Amos (vi. 5) in which David is spoken of as the inventor of musical instruments.

(b.) Chap. xxiii. 6—23. *The twenty-four fathers'-houses of the Levites.* וַיְחַלְּקֵם, this pointing is also found in chap. xxiv. 3 (where, however, more accurate editions, for example that of *R. Norzi*, have וַיַּחְלְקֵם); besides these there are MSS. and editions in which we find the ordinary Piel וַיְחַלְּקֵם and a rare but intelligible form of the imperfect Kal וַיַּחְלְקֵם (*cf. J. H. Michaelis* not. crit.). The last form is accredited by *R. D. Kimchi*, in chap. xxiv. 3, and he expressly states that the regular form answers to it; *cf. R. Norzi* on this passage. We are led by such passages as chap. xxiv. 4, 5; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18 (xxviii. 21) Nehem. ix. 22 to expect a Kal. The Niphal, which very seldom occurs, would have to be rendered *distribuit sibi*, a rendering which would cause some difficulty; still we might bring forward the form הֵעָשׂוּתוֹ, Ezek. xliii. 18, in explanation of the use of the Niphal in the word וַיִּחָלְקֵם. We must necessarily pronounce it a Piel (in the Chronicles it occurs nowhere but in chap. xvi. 3) if the pointing וַיְחַלְּקֵם (= וַיַּחְלְקֵם) were supported by good MSS., but this is not the case. This pointing appears to us to have originated in a very simple conjecture, and in the wish to substitute a similar expression for the traditional reading וַיִּחָלְקֵם. For this reason we are unable to subscribe to the opinion of *Gesenius* (thes. p. 483) and *Ewald* (Lehrb. 64. c.), that the Piel was the form originally intended. וַיִּחָלְקֵם, which is the pointing that must be adopted both here and in chap. xxiv. 3, admits of explanation as a Kal; in consequence of the suffix the two consonants *Koph* and *Lamed* lose their vowel, and the Cheth before these two vowelless consonants, which as a Guttural was previously written with Patach, now takes a Kametz. In other cases indeed the vowel, which has been dropt, reappears in an earlier part of the word, as for example תַּעֲבֹדֵם from תַּעֲבְדֵם Ex. xx. 5, but as the general laws of inflexion are not opposed to the insertion of the Kametz, and there are cases in which it is so inserted, *e.g.* in יִשְׁחָמוּם from יִשְׁחֲמוּ 2 Kings x. 14, we need not hesitate to assume that a Kametz has been introduced here, and

that the Patach under the Yod has been consequently changed into Seghol, according to a well known rule. There can be no doubt that *D. Kimchi* had this explanation of the pointing in his mind, when starting from the regular form וַיַּחְלְקֵם (or וַיְחַלְקֵם) he attributed the change of the Patach under the Yod into Seghol to the influence of the following Kametz.—מחלקות is the second Accusative: *into sections according to the sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath and Merari, i.e.* according to the three great families into which the tribe of Levi had been from time immemorial divided, *cf.* chap. v. 27, vi. 1.—After the announcement in v. 5, and the foregoing verses, we expect an account of the different sections into which the Levites were divided; but according to the statement in *v.* 24, which forms an introduction to the supplementary remarks in vv. 24—32, the sons of Levi are here mentioned first according to their fathers'-houses, and in fact only such of the fathers'-houses are named as performed the work connected with the service of the house of Jehovah, that is to say the 24,000 mentioned in v. 4; the singers, doorkeepers, scribes and judges are noticed afterwards. The twenty-four thousand alone are described here, as we may see from the fact that many of the names which occur in this passage are mentioned again in chap. xxiv. 20—31, where we have a list of the heads of the houses of these Levites, and in chap. xxvi. 20—28, where the management of the treasures of the house of God, which was committed to certain individuals among them, is treated of, whereas we find totally different names in the account of the twenty-four classes of singers (chap. xxv. 1—31), of the doorkeepers (chap. xxvi. 1—19), and of the scribes and judges (chap. xxvi. 29—32). As the fathers'-houses of the priests coincide with the twenty-four classes into which they were divided (chap. xxiv. 1—19), so may we conclude that the fathers'-houses of those Levites, who cast lots in the same manner as their brethren the priests, coincided with the classes. We are not informed in the Book of Chronicles into how many classes these Levites were divided; but as they cast the lots precisely in the same manner as the priests, we may safely assume that they were also divided into twenty-four classes, especially as we learn from v. 25 that the singers also formed twenty-four classes. When

Josephus expressly says (Ant. 7, 14, 7) that David divided these Levites into twenty-four classes, he certainly catches the meaning of the announcement in chap. xxiv. 31. It will therefore be necessary to examine the verses before us for the purpose of seeing whether there are twenty-four fathers'-houses mentioned in them. In replying to this question we shall compare chap. xxiv. 20—31, and xxvi. 20—28, as very many of the names which occur in the passage before us are repeated there.

Vv. 7—11. *Gershon.* The two leading branches of Gershon were *Laadan* and *Shimei.* V. 8. The principal branch *Laadan* was first divided into three fathers'-houses, the head *Jehiel, Zetham,* and *Joel.*—V. 9. In the fathers'-house of Laadan there were also included three sons of Shimei, not the Shimei mentioned in *v.* 7, whose sons are given in *v.* 10, but those of another Shimei belonging to the family of Laadan. The three fathers'-houses of Shimei were *Shelomith* (Keri) or *Shelomoth* (Kethib), *Chaziel* and *Haran.* The note, "these are the heads of the fathers'-houses of Laadan," states most distinctly, that there were 3 × 3 fathers'-houses belonging to Laadan.—V. 10. Now first do we come to the fathers'-houses of the Shimei, who is mentioned in v. 7 by the side of Laadan. There were three fathers'-houses belonging to him; these houses were founded by four sons, *Jochath, Zina,* or *Ziza* (v. 11), *Jeush* and *Beriah,* the last two forming *one father's-house and one official class* (chap. xxiv. 3, 2 Chr. xvii. 14) on account of the paucity of their numbers.—Thus Gershon had nine fathers'-houses, six of them the fathers'-houses of Laadan and three the fathers'-houses of Shimei.

Vv. 12—20. *Kohath.*—V. 12. The four leading branches of Kohath are given in precisely the same way in chap. v. 28, vi. 3; Ex. vi. 18, &c.—V. 13. Of the sons of *Amram,* Aaron is not reckoned here, *for he was set apart, to consecrate him as most holy* (lit. *holy of holies,* a term which is nowhere else applied to Aaron), *he and his sons for ever* (that they might discharge the priestly duties) *to serve him and to bless his name;* this duty, however, was not confined to them, but belonged to the other Levites also, Deut. x. 8. Aaron's sons form the subject of chap. xxv. 1—19. —V. 14. Hence only such of the descendants of Amram are noticed here, as belonged to the line of his son Moses, for *Moses the man of God* (Deut. xxxiii. 1 and elsewhere) *his sons are*

named according to the tribe of Levi, they were reckoned among the Levites generally and did not belong to that portion of Levi to which the priestly duties were assigned.—V. 15. The birth of *Gershom* is mentioned in Ex. ii. 22: *Gershom* and *Eliezer* are spoken of Ex. xviii. 3 seq.—V. 16. *Sons* (although only one name follows), *Shebuel the head;* from the remark made in v. 17 we may conclude that Gershom had other sons, but they were reckoned as part of the fathers'-house of Gershom, and therefore are not named.—V. 17. Eliezer had only one son, *Rechabiah,* whose fathers'-house included *very many.* Thus the descendants of Amram, who were not priests, consisted of two fathers'-houses: Shebuel and Rechabiah.—V. 18. The sons of *Izhar* formed *one* fathers'-house *Shelomith* (Shelomoth, chap. xxiv. 22). V. 19. *Chebron* consisted of four fathers'-houses, the names of which occur again in the same order at chap. xxiv. 23.—V. 20. *Uzziel* contained two fathers'-houses, which are mentioned again in the same way at chap. xxiv. 24 seq. Thus Kohath was also the founder of nine Levitical fathers'-houses, besides the priests, and these nine (a point worthy of attention) are mentioned again by the same names at chap. xxiv. 20—25.

Vv. 21—23. *Merari.* The two sons *Machli* and *Mushi* are described in chap. vi. 4, Ex. vi. 19, and Num. iii. 33, as the two leading branches of Merari. But in chap. xxiv. 26 seq. we find the names of the sons of *Jaaziah the son of Merari,* a third leading branch who were the founders of three fathers'-houses, *Shoham, Zakkur,* and *Ibri.* According to all that precedes we are justified in assuming that there is a perfect harmony between the list of Merari's descendants given here and that contained in chap. xxiv. 26—31, and can therefore entertain no doubt that Jaaziah and his three sons were originally mentioned in the list before us. As two sons only, Machli and Mushi, are noticed in other passages, we can easily explain how the third name came to be omitted here, whilst there is no way in which we could explain a subsequent and arbitrary interpolation of the name.—V. 22. Eleazar had no sons; his daughters were married to the sons of Kish, *their brethren, i.e.,* their blood relations, according to the law (Num. xxxvi. 6—9). *Kish* then had sons; they are not named here, but are noticed in chap. xxiv. 29: "*the sons of Kish Jerahmeel.*"—V. 23. The sons of Mushi are also named in

chap. xxiv. 30. In itself it is not strange, that there should be another Machli among them, for the same names occur in other instances among relations; but it is strange that the two names Mushi and Machli follow closely the one upon the other, and it may reasonably be conjectured that Machli was placed in the text by mistake, and that this error led to the addition of the number *three*, which we do not find in chap. xxiv. 30. If then we assume that Machli was not originally in the text, the leading branch of Merari consisted of six fathers'-houses: *Shoham, Zakkur, Ibri, Kish-Jerahmeel, Eder, Jeremoth.* Thus Gershom was the founder of sixty-nine fathers'-houses, Kohath of nine, Merari of six, in all *twenty-four*.

Vv. 24—32. *Supplementary remarks.*—V. 24. *These* (the persons just named) *are the sons of Levi according to their fathers'-houses, the heads of the fathers'-houses according as they were numbered* (Num. i. 21 sqq.; Ex. xxx. 14), *in a list of their names* (Num. i. 18, chap. iii. 43) *according to their heads, performing the work* (עֹשֵׂה הַמְּלָאכָה, as in 2 Chr. xxiv. 12, xxxiv. 10, 13, Ezra iii. 9, Nehem. ii. 16 (cf. 2 Chr. xi. 1), is hardly a Singular, but another mode of writing the ordinary plural עֹשֵׂי, which occurs by the side of עֹשֵׂה in 2 Chr. xxiv. 13 (cf. 12), xxxiv. 17 (cf. 10), Nehem. xi. 12, xiii. 10, and evidently has the same signification) *for the service of the house of Jehovah from* (those who were) *twenty years old and upwards.* According to this the Levites who were twenty years old were to take their share of the duties, whereas it was stated at *v.* 3, that the Levites were numbered off for service from their thirtieth year. To reconcile these statements, *Kimchi* and some of the earlier Christian expositors (*e.g.*, *J. H. Michaelis*) assumed that David first took the census according to the law (Num. iv. 3, 23, 30) including only such as were thirty years of age, but that when he perceived that even those who were only twenty years old were able to perform the duties of the sanctuary, which were considerably lightened now that it was no longer moveable, he included in the second census, which was taken, according to v. 27, towards the close of his life, all those who were twenty years of age. We cannot subscribe to this opinion. For (1) the census of the Levites of thirty years of age gave 38,000 (v. 3); these 38,000 were

appointed and no more; it is nowhere stated that this number did not suffice, or that the arrangements founded upon it (vv. 4, 5) were not permanently maintained; (2) the historian shows clearly enough, that he is about to make a statement here which differs from the account he had previously given, for in v. 25 seq. he mentions the reason why David was induced to depart from the ancient legal prescription with reference to the numbering of those who were above thirty years of age, and in v. 27 he expressly points out the source from which he derived this last account. Hence the attempts to bring the two into harmony cannot be sustained, for the evident intention of the author was to communicate two different accounts, according to the one of which the Levites in David's time were numbered from their thirtieth year, whilst according to the other David had already introduced the plan, which was subsequently followed (2 Chr. xxxi. 17; Ezra ii. 8), of appointing the Levites to their duties at their twentieth year.—V. 25 seq. Jehovah *has given rest to his people*, so that they no longer need to wander from one place to another with the dwelling place of Jehovah (chap. xvii. 5), and the consequence of this is, that *he dwells in Jerusalem for ever, and the Levites also have no longer to carry the dwelling and all its vessels for the service thereof* (Num. iii. 7, 8; and iv. 4—33); we may easily supply the conclusion at which these words of David point, viz. since the hard labour is at an end, those who are twenty years old may take part in the service. *No longer to carry*; cf. 2 Chr. v. 11, xxxv. 15.—V. 27. Not *according to the last commands of David* (*J. H. Michaelis*), but *in the last memorials of David*, in which there is a reference to a portion of some historical work, as chap. xxix. 29 clearly shows. הִמָּה מִסְפַּר, *are the number* (*i.e.*, the persons numbered) *of the sons of Levi from their twentieth year.*—V. 28. *For their post was* (no longer to carry the dwelling place and its sacred vessels, but) *by the side of Aaron.*—עַל הַחֲצֵרוֹת *over the forecourts*, עַל לְכָל קֹדֶשׁ, the *lamed* of indirect connection after the construct state, (see on the other hand 2 Chr. xxx. 19).—V. 29. Instead of the preposition *al* we find *lamed* in the subsequent portion of the narrative. And *over all the measures and sizes*, which were kept by the Levites; the meal and oil and wine had all to be offered in certain definite quantities in connection with the burnt offerings

(cf. Ex. xxix. 40).—V. 30. *To thank and to praise;* there is nothing to show that these words refer to the 4000 Levites, who were set apart to praise Jehovah with instruments, nor can it be proved by a reference to chap. xxv. 3, where the words are used in a different connexion. The 24,000 Levites will assuredly not have discharged their duties like dumb servants in the sanctuary. —V. 31. לְכָל before the Infinitive, which is closely connected with the following substantive: *and for the whole of the sacrificing of burnt offerings.—In the number* (2 Sam. ii. 15); *i.e.,* according to the number appointed in the law concerning the festivals (Num. xxviii.). *Continually;* this does not refer to the word *mishpat* which immediately precedes it, but to the *burnt offerings for Jehovah,* which were *continual,* because they had to be always offered again when the appointed days came round, compare Num. xxviii. 6, &c., "*a continual burnt offering.*"—V. 32. With the word וְשָׁמְרוּ the construction is altered and a new commencement made, for after לְעָמַּד in v. 30 the regular order would require לִשְׁמֹר or וְיִשְׁמְרוּ. As a conclusion, the whole of the service of the Levites is briefly described in the well-known words from Num. xviii. 3 sqq.: and *so shall they keep the charge of the tabernacle* (Num. xviii. 4; it followed as a matter of course that this law also referred to the temple about to be built, which was to take the place of the tabernacle) *and the charge of the holy place* (Num. xviii. 5), *and the charge of the sons of Aaron* (cf. Num. xviii. 3, "they shall keep thy charge").

(*c*) Chap. xxiv. 1—19. *The twenty-four priestly classes.*—V. 1. The brief expression, "*and according to the sons of Aaron their classes,*" is perfectly intelligible if we compare it with chap. xxiii. 6. The four *sons of Aaron;* see chap. v. 29; Ex. vi. 23.—V. 2. Compare Lev. x. 1 seq. and Num. iii. 4, in which we find almost exactly the same words as in the verse before us.—V. 3. *And distributed them,* cf. chap. xxiii. 6. On "Ahimelek ben Abiathar (v. 6) of the line of Ithamar by the tribe of Zadok of the line of Eleazar" compare chap. xviii. 16. *According to their official classes* (chap. xxiii. 11) *in their service.*—V. 4. *More numerous with regard to the heads of the men, i.e.,* not with regard to the number of men's heads (see chap. xxiii. 3) but with regard to the leaders of the men when divided into fathers'

houses (see chap. xxvi. 12 seq.). Still the fact that there was a large number of fathers'-houses and of their heads or presidents was no doubt caused by the excess in the number of priests belonging to the family of Eleazar. *And* (David, Zadok, and Ahimelek) *divided them: for the sons of Eleazar's heads of fathers'-houses sixteen, and for the sons of Ithamar's (heads) of fathers'-houses eight.* V. 5. *These with those;* probably in such a manner that Eleazar's sixteen fathers'-houses kept by themselves and Ithamar's fathers'-houses by themselves, and that then they drew the lots alternately according to the rule described in v. 6. The lots were drawn by the fathers'-houses of the two, because from time immemorial there had been in both families *holy princes* (Is. xliii. 28, equivalent to "the princes of the priests," 2 Chr. xxxvi. 14 cf. Jer. lii. 24) and *princes of God* (*Sept.* ἄρχοντες κυρίου, an expression only met with here.) V. 6. *And before the heads of the fathers'-houses of the priests and of the rest of the Levites,* אחד אחד; this expression and the words ראש אחד, which follow immediately after, are found in nearly all the MSS., for very few have ראש אחד, though some expositors (*e.g. Cappellus, Grotius,* and even *Gesenius,* thes. p. 68) pronounce this the original reading. For an explanation of the word אחד we may refer to Num. xxxi. 30, 47; it denotes that which is taken out of a larger number, and according to the context in this case taken out by lot. We may, therefore, render the word a lot, *i.e.* that which is determined by lottery, and translate the passage accordingly; *a single father's-house was a lot for Eleazar, and* (a single father's house) *a lot, a lot for Ithamar.* The order of the sixteen fathers'-houses of Eleazar, and of the eight of Ithamar, was to be decided by lot, and the plan to be adopted was not for all the fathers'-houses of Eleazar to draw first, and then those of Ithamar, but the order of *these and those* was to be fixed *at the same time,* v. 5. Now the names of the twenty-four fathers'-houses might have been put into one urn, but in order to secure the desired alternation of the houses of the two families, it was also possible to place the names of the sixteen houses of Eleazar in one urn, and those of the eight houses of Ithamar in the other. To accommodate the casting of the lots to the inequality of the numbers sixteen and eight, it was arranged that every house of Ithamar should reckon as two lots, or, what is the same thing, that every two houses of

Eleazar should be followed by one of Ithamar. If then we suppose a commencement to have been made with Eleazar, the order would be as follows: 1 and 2 Eleazar; 3, Ithamar; 4 and 5, Eleazar; 6, Ithamar; 7 and 8, Eleazar; 9, Ithamar; and so forth. The order in which the particular houses were to serve was then decided by lot in conformity with this arrangement. The relation between the numbers 8 and 16, and the words אחז and אחז אחז in this verse lead us to this, or some similar conclusion with reference to the manner, in which the order of service was determined by lot. In the different versions the statements contained in this passage have been either obliterated or altered; the former is the case in the *Septuagint* (εἰς εἷς τῷ Ἐλεάζαρ καὶ εἷς εἷς τῷ Ἰθάμαρ, the *Syriac* has the same rendering, but this does not suit the numbers 8 and 16) in the *Vulgate* the words are altered (*unam domum, quae ceteris praeerat, Eleazar; et alteram domum, quae sub se habebat ceteros, Itamar*). The exposition given by the Rabbins (*e.g. Kimchi*) is to my mind unintelligible; cf. *J. H. Michaelis* in loco. V. 19. *These are their classes of office for their service* (v. 3) *to come into the house of Jehovah according to the order, which was appointed for them through Aaron their father* (chap. vi. 17) *as Jehovah had commanded him.* The concluding words must refer to the expression, which frequently occurs in the Pentateuch: "Jehovah spake to Moses and Aaron," *e.g.* Num. iv. 1, 17.

(*d.*) Chap. xxiv. 20—31. *The leaders of the classes of the Levites.* On comparing the names in these verses with those in the section, chap. xxiii. 6—23, we find that the list before us is imperfect. For only the sons of Kohath and Merari are mentioned here; of the sons of Gershon, who must originally have had a place in this list by the side of the others, we find no trace in our present text. But even in that portion of the list which has been preserved, we miss a considerable number of names, which ought to be found in it according to the description given at the head. It is said to contain the names of the heads of the Levitical classes mentioned in chap. xxiii. 6—23 (see vv. 20—22; v. 24 seq.); but we find only the heads of five classes of the Kohathites named, the names of the leaders of the other four classes are omitted here (v. 23) as in chap. xxiii. 19. The same remark applies to the sons of Merari; the classes are noticed

again in this passage, but without the names of the leaders. V. 31. אבות הראישי ; אבות is used here as in many other passages for *Beth Aboth : the father's-house, the head as well as his younger brother. The head* is in apposition to *the father's-house*, just as in chap. xxiii. 17—18 it is in apposition to the names of the fathers'-houses. The passage is paraphrased quite correctly by the Vulgate: *tam majores quam minores, omnes sors aequaliter dividebat.* The order of the classes of the Levites as determined by the lot is not given.

(*e.*) Chap. xxv. *The twenty-four classes of singers.* V. 1. *The princes of the army ;* not the princes of the army of the Levites (Num. iv. 23), but *the leaders of the army of the Israelites*, for the princes, referred to here, must be the same as the "princes of Israel" mentioned in chap. xxiii. 2, and the "princes," chap. xxiv. 6, in connexion with whom the heads of the fathers'-houses of the priests and Levites are noticed in the latter passage, cf. chap. xxvi. 26, and xxvii. 5. *To separate to the service ;* cf. 1 Kings viii. 53, and Num. xvi. 9. *The sons of Asaph ;* the *lamed* is the sign of the accusative, Ezra viii. 24. V. 2. על ידי, cf. chap. vi. 16; this expression occurs four times in these verses. The singular על יד in the verse before us has precisely the same signification. The primary sense is *by the side of the king, of Asaph, &c.*, and this meaning is retained if we render the words, "*under the personal direction.*" But whether the passage really means that King David conducted the singing and the playing in the same manner as Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, is very doubtful. The expression may also be rendered "*according to the arrangements ;*" and, if we adopt this meaning, we should learn from v. 6 that the musical arrangements were made by David, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, together, and hence in vv. 2, 3, and the first clause of v. 6, the reference would simply be to the organisation of the music and singing, though of course this would not preclude the personal superintendence of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman. V. 5. *The seer*, or prophet *of the king*, we are not informed for what reason this title was given to Heman ; in chap. xxi. 9 Gad is called the prophet of David, and in 2 Chr. xxix. 15, the same title is given to Jeduthun. *To blow the horns loudly according to the command of God ;* cf. 2 Chr. xxix. 15, where בדברי האלהים must be rendered in this way ; other expositors

suppose the meaning to be "in divine affairs," *i.e.* in the worship of God (cf. chap. xxvi. 32). דרים is immediately connected with קרן as in other passages with קול; lifting up the horn is equivalent to blowing it loud. V. 6. *All these are under the direction of their father* (Heman) *in the singing at the house of Jehovah, with cymbals, nablia, and viols, for the service of the house of God according to the arrangement of the king, &c.;* the twenty-four here mentioned were therefore set apart to accompany the singing with instrumental music; according to v. 7, every one of them was associated with eleven singers, *for their number together with their brethren, who were practised in singing for Jehovah,* the whole of those who were skilled were 288 = 12 × 24. The number here given merely refers to those who were skilled, for, according to chap. xxiii. 5, the entire body of those, who were set apart to praise Jehovah, numbered four thousand. —V. 8. גורלות משמרת (rendered by the Septuagint κλῆρους ἐφημερίων) lots, by which the Mishmereth of every one of the twenty-four sections was fixed. לעמת stands here in a very peculiar position, it is in the construct state and yet the word governed by it is wanting (cf. chap. xxvi. 12). It is true that in some MSS. the word Mishmereth is repeated after it, so that the text reads משמרת לעמת משמרת (cf. xxvi. 16, Nehem. xii. 24), but this reading seems only to have originated in the desire to make the passage more intelligible. Jewish expositors affirm that the second Mishmereth may be supplied, and appeal to chap. xvii. 5, where the words אל משכן are supplied in a similar manner by ancient commentators. But it is worthy of remark that in Eccl. v. 15 the word לעמת occurs in quite as loose a connection before a whole clause, and as the words "*as the small so the great,*" serve to define it more precisely, the construct state is not inadmissible. The meaning is: in the same manner, as the small so the great; and the words "*as the small so the great,*" are used in chap. xxvi. 13 as being sufficient in themselves to express this meaning. *The skilful as well as the scholar;* the Aramaean word תלמיד only occurs in this passage of the Old Testament. From the previous verse it is evident, that the distinction implied in these words is that between the twelve skilled men in each of the classes, and the rest of the members of the same class.—Vv. 9—31. The result of the lot

was that the four sons of Asaph had the first, third, fifth, and seventh places; and the six sons of Jeduthun, the second, fourth, eighth, tenth, twelfth, and fourteenth; the four sons of Heman, the sixth, ninth, eleventh, and thirteenth. Just as the classes, into which the 24,000 Levites referred to in chap. xxiii. 6—23 were divided, are traced back to the three great families of Levi: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, so are also the Levites, who had the charge of the music and singing; for their twenty-four classes are associated with the three men, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, of whom Asaph was a descendant of Gershon, Jeduthun (also called Ethan) of Merari, and Heman of Kohath. In the account of the removal of the ark in chap. xv., the only one of the names mentioned here, which we find by the side of those of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan (or Jeduthun), is Matthiah (vv. 18, 21); but we have no reason to expect to find the names of the twenty-four classes mentioned here.

(f.) Chap. xxvi. 1—19. *The classes of the doorkeepers.* V. 8 The singular אִישׁ חַיִל (a man with strength) would necessarily refer to each one of the sons of Obed-edom: *every one was an able man with strength for the service;* but there is no possibility of concealing the difficulty connected with such an explanation, and in order to remove it we may perhaps assume that the word בְּכֹר has fallen out before אִישׁ, cf. chap. x. 12.—V. 10. *Shimri the head,* not the firstborn (cf. Zechariah the firstborn, v. 2, Shemaiah the firstborn, v. 4), *for there was no firstborn,* probably because the family entitled to the right of primogeniture had died out (hence the Syriac: *his eldest son had died*), or because there were none of the existing families which could claim that right.—V. 12. *These classes of doorkeepers* (or to speak more precisely), *the head of the men* (chap. xxiv. 4, for these alone had been mentioned in the preceding verses) had the care of *the watches along with their brethren to render service in the house of Jehovah* (chap. xvi. 37).—V. 15. *And to his sons* (there was allotted the care of) *the house of collections.* The *house of Asuppim,* or briefly *Asuppim* (v. 17), was no doubt a store-house, which was situated in the outer fore-court; according to this passage it was near the south door of the temple, for the sons of Obed-edom had the charge of it, and they were doorkeepers towards the south. Two at a time were required to watch it (v.

17), from which we may perhaps infer that the house had two entrances, to each of which two doorkeepers were appointed. The rendering of the Vulgate *(in qua parte domus erat seniorum concilium)* seems merely to rest upon a conjecture that the word *Asuppim* means *an assembly of men*. In the Septuagint the word is retained κατέναντι οἴκου Ἐσεφίμ.—V. 16. *To Shuppim* is perfectly unintelligible. The word can only be taken as a proper name (chap. vii. 12), but the context does not lead us to expect a proper name here, on the contrary, according to the order preserved in these verses generally, "*to Hosah*" should follow directly. The name Shuppim does not occur in the Septuagint. Hence we may assume that it crept into the text through an error in consequence of the repetition of the last two syllables of the word before. *To Hosah* fell the lot *towards the west*. *The gate Shalleketh* (perhaps the *rubbish gate*, 2 Kings xxiii. 11) is only mentioned here. The intimation that it was *on the rising road* helps us to determine its position. According to the context we must look for it on the western side of the outer fore-court, opposite to the western door of the temple. This gate was reached by an ascending road leading from the lower city, for the area of the temple, on the western edge of which the gate was situated, overhung the lower city. *One watch over against the other*; because it was Hosah's duty to provide with a watch both the western gate of the temple and also the gate Shalleketh, which was opposite to it; see v. 18.—V. 17 seq. Recapitulation of the posts, which the porters had to occupy, and an account of the number employed. Six men were stationed at the east gate, four men were engaged every day at the north gate, four at the south gate, and at the stores or store-house (v. 15) near the south door two each, probably posted at two different places; lastly, at the Pharbar towards the west there were six men stationed, four of whom kept guard on the outside *towards the* (ascending) *road* mentioned in v. 16, and two in the inside *towards Pharbar*. Hence there were twenty-four men employed daily in keeping guard. Are we to understand by this twenty-four men, or twenty-four leaders with their attendants? In the previous verses there can be no doubt that the leaders of the porters alone are mentioned (cf. v. 12); according to chap. xxiii. 6, the whole number of the porters was 4000, a

number from which we may conclude that far more than twenty-four individuals would be employed every day in keeping guard. It might be thought that the thousands referred to in chap. xxiii. 6 are not adopted to furnish us with a criterion by which to reply to the query just raised, since the numbers given in the more precise details are always considerably smaller. But the number mentioned here, twenty-four, seems to indicate that the individuals referred to were the leaders of twenty-four divisions. —V. 19. The conclusion again points out the fact that the porters were taken from the Korahites (Kohathites) and Merarites (cf. vv. 1 and 10).

(*g.*) Chap. xxvi. 20—28. *The managers of the treasures of the sanctuary.*—V. 20. The heading "*and the Levites*" could only indicate that the section which follows treated of Levites, who were neither singers nor porters. But we are struck by its brevity. Ahijah, whose name occurs immediately after the word *Levites*, is not mentioned in the previous lists, whereas they contain the names of most of the other officers referred to, and notices of all the families to which they belonged; moreover in the case of the rest of the officers both their families and pedigree are given with intentional fulness, whereas Ahijah, whose name is totally unknown, is introduced abruptly without further information; and lastly, if this Ahijah was *over the treasures of the house of God and the treasures of the consecrated things*, he must have united in his own person those very offices, of which the occupants are named in the verses that follow. We cannot therefore come to any other conclusion than that the reading is incorrect. Now the *Septuagint* contains no notice of Ahijah, but has instead the very suitable heading: *καὶ οἱ Λευῖται ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν οἴκου κυρίου καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν τῶν καθηγιασμένων.* Hence in the place of והלוים אחיה they read והלוים אחיהם (*cf. e.g.*, chap. vi. 29; 2 Chr. xxix. 34); and this reading has been already defended by *J. D. Michaelis* in the notes to his German translation of the Old Testament.—V. 21. *The sons of Laadan* (or to point out their Levitical descent with greater precision) *the sons of the Gershunnite* (or of Gershon), who belong to *Laadan* (chap. xxiii. 7 seq.), *the heads of the fathers' houses of Laadan the Gershunnite: Jechieli* (v. 22) *and the sons of Jechieli Zetham and Joel his brother are*

(over the) *treasures of the house of Jehovah.*—V. 23. For the four large families of the Levitical gens, Kohath: Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (the last is always called Uzziel, chap. xxiii. 12, and *v.* 28, but the adjective in *i*, *Ozzieli*, is found in Num. iii. 27 as well as here).—V 24. *Shebuel the son of Gershom the son of Moses was prince over the treasures.* There can hardly be any doubt that this is the meaning intended to be conveyed by the passage, but to bring it clearly out the *Vav cop.* before Shebuel, which does not appear in the *Vulgate*, must be erased. Shebuel has been mentioned already in chap. xxiii. 16 and xxiv. 20 (Shubael).—V. 25. *And his* (viz., Shebuel's) *brethren* (who belong) *to Eliezer* (are) *Rechabiah his* (Eliezer's) *son* or the sons of Rechabiah (chap. xxiv. 21); but these were brethren of Shebuel, because they were descended from Moses through Eliezer, of whom the sons of Shebuel were descendants through his son Gershom (chap. xxiii. 16 seq.). From the sons of Rechabiah sprang *Shelomith* or *Shelomoth*, a celebrated man, as the careful account of his ancestors clearly shows.—V. 26. *And this Shelomoth and his brethren were over all the treasures of the consecrated gifts, which David the king and the heads of the fathers'-houses and the princes* (instead of לְשָׂרֵי the reading וְשָׂרֵי as in chap. xxix. 6 must be adopted, as it has been by the *Vulgate*) *over the thousands and over the hundreds and the princes of the army had dedicated.*—V. 27. A parenthesis: *of the wars and of the spoil* (in other words, *of the spoil taken in the wars*) *they had dedicated to make the house of Jehovah strong.* חַזֵּק in other passages means to strengthen old buildings and walls by repairing them (2 Kings xii. 7 sqq.; Neh. iii. 7 sqq.), but this cannot be the meaning here. The word occurs in chap. xxix. 12 along with גַּדֵּל, and as making great and making strong are correlative notions, we feel no hesitation in rendering it here *to make great and strong.* The *lamed* in *l'beth* is a sign of the accusative, cf. chap. xxix. 12.—V. 28. The הַ in הַהִקְדִּישׁ takes the place of the relative pronoun, as in chap. xxix. 17; 2 Chr. xxix. 36; Ezra viii. 25, x. 14, 17. כֹּל הַמְקֻדָּשׁ concludes the account: that which had been dedicated by *all who had dedicated* was *on the hand of Shelomoth and his brethren, i.e.*, it was entrusted to them.—There was thus a threefold distinction made in the treasures, that were committed to

the custody of the different officers: 1. The sons of Jechieli (Zetham and Joel) had the oversight of the treasures of the house of God, which, as we may infer from chap. xxix. 8, had been brought in the shape of freewill-offerings; (2) Shebuel was prince over the treasures, perhaps over the money which had accumulated from the regular tax for the sanctuary (Ex. xxx. 11—16), the redemption-fees (*e.g.* for the first-born, Num. xviii. 16 sqq.), or the discharge of vows (Lev. xxvii.); hence he had the charge of a portion of the money which is described in 2 Kings xii. 5 as כסף הקדשים; (3) Shelomith and his brethren had the care of the dedicated offerings, which are called the holy things in 2 Kings in xii. 19, in distinction from the *sacred money* mentioned in v. 5. Zetham and Joel belonged to the family of Gershon; Shebuel and Shelomith to that of Kohath; and the third great Levitical family, Merari, had no share in the management of the treasures.

(*h.*) Chap. xxvi. 29—32. *The officers appointed for outward affairs.*—V. 29. *Chenaniah* (chap. xv. 22, 27) *and his sons* (who belonged to the family of) *Izhar* (and to the *gens* of Kohath) *for outward business, as scribes and judges.* The outward business of the Levites, in contradistinction to the work connected with the service of the sanctuary, seems from this to have consisted in the discharge of the functions of scribes and judges (chap. xxiii. 4.) From Neh. xi. 16, it appears that the outward business was also connected with the temple, embracing perhaps the collection of contributions; and since the officers mentioned in v. 30—32 had to look after this, it may be assumed that they also, like the scribes and judges, were reckoned among the officers who had the charge of the outward business, although it is not expressly stated in these verses.—V. 30. *Hashabiah and his brethren,* (who belonged to the family of Hebron of the *gens* of Kohath), *brave men, seventeen hundred* were *over the contributions* (פְּקֻדָּה must here mean that which was determined, a fixed tax or contribution, and this meaning is required on account of its connection with "Israel," which is not met with anywhere else; see, *e.g.*, chap. xxiii. 11 and xxiv. 3) *of Israel on the side of the Jordan towards the west* (a similar description of the country on this side of the river is found in Josh. xxii. 7) *for all the affairs of Jehovah and for the service of the king* (cf. v. 32).—V. 31. *Jerijah the*

head and—(v. 32) *his brethren* (who also belonged to the family of Hebron) *were valiant men, two thousand seven hundred heads of fathers'-houses, whom David had appointed as overseers over the two tribes and a half on the east of the Jordan, for every affair of God and for every affair of the king.* Between "*Jerijah the head*" in v. 31, and "*and his brethren*" in v. 32, we have the parenthesis: *as for the Hebronites, according to their descents, according to fathers'-houses, they were examined in the fortieth year of David's reign, and there were found among them brave heroes in Jazer in Gilead* (cf. v. *Raumer* Pal. p. 229). This parenthesis, which treats of distinguished Hebronites in the country to the east of the Jordan, and explains the reason why they were entrusted with the post of overseers, separates the connected parts of the same sentence, and thus renders the meaning of these two verses somewhat obscure.

9. CHAPTER XXVII.

ACCOUNT OF THE ARMY AND OF DAVID'S OFFICERS.

Vv. 1—15. *The twelve divisions of the army.* V. 1. Full heading to the lists which follow in vv. 2—15; *and the sons of Israel according to their number* (in definite numbers), *the heads of the fathers'-houses and the princes over the thousands and the* hundreds and their scribes, who served the king in every affair of *the divisions, which came in and went out month by month of all months of the year, one division twenty-four thousand men.* In the list itself, however, we find only the twelve classes, the list of those belonging to them, and their leaders; so that the short heading: the Israelites according to their number and the princes of the divisions who served the king (cf. chap. xxviii, 1) would fully suffice. It may be safely assumed that the heading originally referred to a more elaborate description of the classes and their different officers, from which we have here only a shorter extract.—V. 3. Apposition to Jashobeam (v. 2): *of the sons of Perez, the head of all the princes of the armies for the first month.* Hence it is not said that Jashobeam was the head of all the princes of the armies, but it is emphatically stated that he, the man of the family of Perez, from whom David also sprang,

had the command in chief of all the princes of division for the first month. The commander of the whole army was Joab, v. 34.—V. 4. Before *Dodai* there must have fallen out "*Eliezer the son of,*" according to chap. xi. 12. ומדלקתו ומקלות הנגיד, thoroughly unintelligible words: at the end of verse 6 a similar passage occurs, from which we may see that the Vav before the middle word should be erased: "*and his division, Mikloth the prince*" might perhaps mean and his division is that over which Mikloth was prince. The expression is very brief, merely containing a hint, but in a short list we cannot be surprised to find merely hints in the place of full sentences. V. 7. *Asahel* (chap. xi. 26); he was slain by Abner at the very commencement of David's reign, (2 Sam. ii. 18—23); perhaps the company, of which Asahel was the captain, may have been increased to a division when the plan of the twelve divisions was afterwards adopted, and may have continued to pass as Asahel's division; or it is possible that one division may have been called by the name of the fallen hero in honour of his memory. In the words "*and Gebadiah his son after him,*" after his death, there is certainly contained an intimation of Asahel's death at the beginning of David's reign.

Vv. 16—24. *The princes of the twelve tribes.* The tribes mentioned are Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulon, Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, and Dan; Gad and Asher are omitted. In the list of the tribes in chap. iv., vii., Zebulon is wanting, and as we know of no reason for the omission of the name of Zebulon there, so are we unable to determine why Gad and Asher should not be mentioned here.—V. 18. *Elihu,* probably the same as Eliab mentioned in chap. ii. 13; the Septuagint rendering is *Ελιὰβ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Δαυίδ.* He was the eldest brother of David, the first-born of his father, and as such had probably a right to be a ruler in the tribe of Judah.—V. 23. The fact, that *David had not taken their number from those who were twenty years old and under,* is accounted for in the clause which follows: *for Jehovah had promised to make Israel as numerous as the stars of heaven* (Gen. xxii. 17). The meaning of this explanation can only be that the foregoing numbers do not refer to all the Israelites, because it was impossible for David to number them all, since they were as numerous as the stars of heaven which cannot be numbered. The numbering of the

Israelites from twenty years and upwards was undertaken, as we may infer from the reference made to it in this passage, in order that its results might be made available for dividing the army into twelve sections, and for the other arrangements described in this chapter.—V. 24. The numbering was undertaken by *Joab ben Zeruiah, who began to number, but did not complete it, and it was the cause of wrath* (from God) *upon Israel* (2 Chr. xix. 10, xxiv. 18). The numbering referred to is that of which we have a full account in chap. xxi.; it was never finished (v. 6), and the consequence of the wrath of God was a pestilence (v. 14). The word במספר is generally supposed to denote a *book*. But this would be the only passage in which it had such a meaning, and the use of it before דברי הימים (the daily histories) is the more striking, as we find in every other case the word *sepher* in this connexion (*e.g.* 2 Kings xii. 20, xiii. 8—12, xiv. 15, 18, 28, xv. 6). It might be imagined, that through the influence of the previous word *mispar* our *b'mispar* had been substituted for b'sepher, but as the expression ספר דברי הימים does not occur in the Chronicles, we must retain the word as written in the text, and render the passage thus: *and the number did not come into the number of the daily records of King David.* In this case "into the number" would mean into the section which treats of the numbering. It is not expressly stated for what reason the account of the numbering had no place in the daily records of David, but it is evident from the context of this verse, that there were scruples felt as to the preservation of an exact record, because of the mournful events connected with the census, and the wrath of God of which it had been the occasion. The account of the census taken by Joab was given above (chap. xxi. 5), but, as this passage clearly shows, it must have been copied from some other source, and not from the daily records of David. At the same time this remark seems to indicate that the lists given in the present chapter, and possibly those in the preceding chapters, were taken from the daily records of David, for the intimation that the account of the numbering was not to be found in them certainly implies, that other accounts given here could be found there.

Vv. 25—31. *The officers who had the charge of David's property and possessions.* The list is very exact, and claims our

attention not merely on account of the names, but for the description which it contains of the possessions and revenue of the king. His property consisted of: (1) *treasures*, or rather, as the contrast to No. 2 shows, such of the treasures as were kept in Jerusalem;—(2) *treasures in the field, in the cities, in the villages, and in the towers and fortresses*, by which we are most likely to understand the income which the king derived from his property outside Jerusalem;—(3) *corn-fields*;—(4) *vineyards*;—(5) *plantations of olives and sycamores in the Shephelah, i.e.* the fertile plain, between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean Sea; the king's officers had to see to the cultivation of the fields, vineyards, and plantations; and again certain of the officers had the oversight of *the stores of wine in the vineyards* (v. 27) *and the stores of oil* (v. 28);—(6) *oxen*, both those which were fed in Sharon, the strip of land along the coast between Cæsarea Palestinae, and Joppa, and those which were scattered in the different valleys of the land; (7) *camels*;—(8) *asses*;—(9) *sheep*. All these possessions are included in v. 31 under the one word רְכוּשׁ, which is used in other passages to denote the moveable possessions of nomad chiefs (*e.g.* Gen. xii. 5; xiii. 6); and the men who had the management of these are called both here and in the next chapter "princes of the *recosh*" (substance), "princes of all the *recosh*." As the expression *recosh* calls to mind the circumstances of the Israelites in former times, when their leaders were nomad-chiefs, so do many of the possessions point back to the same circumstances, whilst others (*e.g.* the towers) contain a clear indication of the great change, which had taken place in Israel through the introduction of a monarchical government. The property of David consisted partly of those things, which constitute the wealth of a nomad-chief, and partly of the things which furnish the king of an organized state, whose foundations rest on the firm basis of agriculture and well regulated commerce, with the means of giving stability to his throne. It cannot be an accidental thing that just twelve officers should be named. The management of the royal possessions was also divided into twelve sections; so that the number, which occurs so frequently as a normal number in the political and religious institutions of the people, was also followed in connexion with the property referred to here. Of the officers *Shimei* was of

Ramah in the land of Benjamin; Zabdi of *Shepam* (probably on the south-eastern frontier of the land of Judah, Num. xxxiv. 10 seq.); Baal-Hanan of *Geder* or *Gedera* in the land of Judah; Shihai or Shirtai (Keri) of *Sharon*, the strip of land on the coast; Obil (whose name reminds us of the Arabic word for *a camel-driver*) of the people of *Ishmael*; Jechdeiah of *Meronoth*, a place unknown to us (the Septuagint has ὁ ἐκ Μεραθών, but we never meet with a place of this name); Jazir of the people of *Hagar* (*cf.* chap. v. 10—19). Thus there were foreigners among these officers; an Ishmaelite and a Hagarite had charge of the camels and the sheep, which were probably kept in districts, that had formerly supplied the nomadic Ishmaelites and Hagarites with pasture for their camels and sheep, but had come into David's possession in consequence of his conquests in the country to the east of the Jordan. The vineyards, in which the stores of wine were kept (v. 27), were no doubt in the vine-growing districts to the south of the land, especially in the province of Judah (Num. xiii. 23 seq.; Gen. xlix. 11 seq.), and the charge of them was entrusted to two men, belonging to these districts.

Vv. 32—34. *A short list of David's ministers*, which forms a counterpart both in its contents and style to the lists contained in 2 Sam. viii. 15—18; 1 Chr. xviii. 15—17; and 2 Sam. xx. 23—26. If with few exceptions we find different names here from those in the other lists, we must bear in mind that some of the persons mentioned were appointed to other departments of service (we find no *counsellor* in the other lists, and no one who was "*with the king's sons*"), whilst in other cases we have here successors in the same office.—V. 32. There is a *Jonathan*, son of Shimea, David's brother, mentioned in chap. xx. 7 and 2 Sam. xxi. 21, probably the same person as *the relative of David* referred to here; דּוֹד, usually the father's brother (hence *Septuagint* πατράδελφος, *Vulgate* patruus), is also used for a *relation* generally, and therefore may include a nephew. This Jonathan was a *counsellor* (and as is added), *an intelligent and learned man was he.* סוֹפֵר does not denote the office, but when used with מֵבִין means *learned, versed in the Scriptures*, as in Ezra vii. 6. The office of Sopher was filled by Shavshah (chap. xviii. 16). *Jehiel ben Chakmoni was with the king's sons*, probably as tutor; whether the Jehiel mentioned in chap. xxiii. 8 is meant we can-

not tell; in chap. xi. 11 Jashobeam is called a son of Chakmoni. —V. 33. *Ahithophel* (2 Sam. xv. 31, xvi. 23, xvii. 1 sqq.) is also described in the passages quoted as the confidential counsellor of the king, who killed himself at the time of Absalom's conspiracy. —V. 34. After *Ahithophel*, probably after his death, *Jehoiada ben Benaiah was the king's counsellor*. We need not hesitate to pronounce this a case of transposition, since the person referred to must certainly be the Benaiah ben Jehoiada, who is already known to us in connection with David's history (v. 5, chap. xi. 22), and who is described in the other lists (*e.g.*, chap. xviii. 17) as the captain of David's body-guard, a post which by no means precluded him from attending the king as counsellor. If, however, this conjecture is not adopted, we must suppose him to have been a son of this Benaiah, and to have been called by his grandfather's name. *And Abiathar;* are we to supply: *was also counsellor?* The high priest of the family of Ithamar is referred to here. *Joab* occurs in all the lists. Hence, if we except Jehiel, the names given here are already known to us in connection with the history of David in the Books of Samuel. But the list itself cannot have been taken from those books, for the precise account of the offices which they filled is not given there. We must therefore conclude that this list was taken from the same sources to which our historian had already gone for the lists given before.

10. Chap. xxviii.—xxix.

David's last instructions; and his death.

1. Chap. xxviii. *In an assembly of the people David seriously charges Solomon to build the temple.*—V. 1. *All the princes of Israel*, viz., *the princes of the tribes* (a list of whom is given in chap. xxvii. 16—22), *the princes of the divisions that serve the king* (chap. xxvii. 1—15), *the princes of the thousands and of the hundreds* (chap. xxvii. 1), *the princes of all the property and possessions of the king and his sons* (they are described in chap. xxvii. 25—31, though nothing is said there about the property of David's sons; the *Vulgate* has *filiosque suos*, but the *famed*

can hardly be the sign of the accusative in this instance, for it is prefixed to לְמֶלֶךְ, the word immediately before, and if the sons of David were to be expressly singled out as taking part in the assembly, it is not likely that they would be noticed in so incidental a manner), *along with the officers of the court, and the heroes, and all the brave heroes* (the *lamed* here is the sign of the accusative, for as the governing verb is at so great a distance it was natural to point out the case by means of the preposition) *to Jerusalem.*—סָרִיסִים *eunuchs, Sept.* σὺν τοῖς εὐνούχοις, *Vulg. cum eunuchis.* They are mentioned in 1 Sam. viii. 15 as officers of the kings of Israel, and also in 1 Kings xxii. 9 and other passages. The primary meaning of the word need not be always stringently maintained; for as the officers of court were usually eunuchs, the word may easily have come to denote such officers, even when they were not actually eunuchs. Moreover, we may assume without any hesitation that the practice of the courts of heathen kings, *e.g.*, the Babylonian and Persian, in which the Sarisim are frequently mentioned, had some influence in determining the use of the word here (cf. 2 Kings xx. 18; Esther i. 10—15).—V. 2. The aged king *stood up upon his feet*, that he might address the assembled people standing. Hitherto he had probably been sitting upon his throne, not lying upon his bed as Jewish expositors infer from 1 Kings i. 1.—*My brethren;* 1 Sam. xxx. 23; 2 Sam. xix. 13. *I, in my heart to build;* I had it in my mind to build, cf. chap. xxii. 7. *For the ark of the covenant of Jehovah and for the footstool of the feet of our God; i.e.*, for the ark and for the כַּפֹּרֶת over it, which might be described as his footstool, because the glory of Jehovah was enthroned above it betwen the cherubim. This is in harmony with v. 11 where the holy of holies is called בֵּית הַכַּפֹּרֶת. *I have made ready for building;* by collecting materials (chap. xxii. 2—4, 14 sqq.)—V. 4. On the first words see chap. xi. 2. *And Judah he hath chosen as prince*, cf. chap. v. 2.—V. 5. After the parenthesis, *for Jehovah hath given me many sons*, the address is not continued with the perfect, and of all my sons *he chose Solomon*, but has a fresh beginning: *then he chose. Upon the throne of the kingdom of Jehovah;* this expression only occurs here. There is a similar one in chap. xxix. 23, *the throne of Jehovah,*

compare chap. xvii. 14, "My kingdom."—V. 6, see chap. xxii. 10. —V. 7. *Establishes his kingdom;* chap. xvii. 11. *If he be constant;* a similar condition is imposed upon Solomon by God in 1 Kings iii. 14, ix. 4; and the words of Solomon in 1 Kings viii. 61 also call to mind these words, in which the expression *as at this time* also occurs, cf. 2 Chr. vi. 15.—V. 8. *And now before the eyes of all Israel, the assembled community of Jehovah, and in the ears of our God,* I impress the injunction upon your hearts: *observe and seek,* &c. The solemn injunction recals Deut. iv. 26, xxx. 19, and the conclusion of the verse reminds of Deut. iv. 21; Jer. iii. 18; Lev. xxv. 46.—V. 9. David now turns to Solomon; the commencement of his address to him is contained in vv. 9, 10, and, after a long parenthesis vv. 11—19, the continuation in vv. 20, 21.—Give heed to *the God of thy father;* according to chap. xxix. 10 we might be led to suppose that reference was here made to Israel, the common father of all the Israelites, but a comparison of chap. xxviii. 20 shows that it is more natural to suppose that the God of David is meant here, the God who had always assisted David (Ps. xviii. 3). בלב שלם *with a perfect and entire heart,* chap. xxix. 9—19; 1 Kings viii. 61.—V. 10. The expression, "*be strong and do it,*" is repeated in v. 20, so that the address which is broken off here is taken up again by the repetition of the concluding words of the verse before us.

Vv. 11—19. David breaks off his address, and gives to Solomon the sketches and plans of the sacred buildings and other objects, vv. 11—18, accompanying the gifts with the solemn words contained in v. 19. The proceedings in the assembly are described with dramatic distinctness, and only in proportion as we enter thoroughly into the lifelike narrative before us, can we explain the introduction of the account contained in these verses precisely in this connexion.—V. 11. *The pattern;* Ex. xxv. 40. *The hall;* 1 Kings vi. 3; 2 Chr. iii. 4. וברתיו not, *and of the houses of the hall;* the masculine suffix refers to the *temple,* as we may clearly see from the words that follow, in which the suffix is repeated. The word *temple* may easily be supplied. The buildings referred to are those for the two divisions of the temple, for the nave or holy place, and for the room behind or holy of holies. גנזכין only occurs in this passage; the connexion with גנזים Esther iii. 9, iv. 7, and the Chaldee גנזין Ezra vii. 20, is unmis-

takeable, and the meaning *treasure-chambers* is thereby sustained. These rooms were probably in the house of three stories high by the side of the temple. עליותין, which is also met with in 2 Chr. iii. 9, is only used in these two passages. The reference is to the *upper chambers* of the temple. We are not told where they were built. Probably they were between the ceiling of the Debir, or holy of holies, and the roof of the building, which no doubt kept the same level over all the three principal divisions of the temple. The roof was thirty cubits high, the Debir was twenty cubits square, and twenty high; there was therefore a space between of twenty cubits square and ten in height which may have been divided into several rooms, or *upper chambers*. The *inner chambers* must mean the forecourt and the nave or holy place, since the *Beth haccapporeth* or holy of holies, where the ark of the covenant, with the Capporeth, was kept (Ex. xxv. 17 sqq), follows immediately after.—V. 12. *And the form of all that was in the spirit with him;* the spirit with him is τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν αὐτῷ, 1 Cor. ii. 11; the form of that which floated before his mind he communicated to Solomon. The word כל which is directly governed by *tabnith* is continued by the words: *the form of the forecourts of the house of Jehovah, and of all the cells round about* (chap. xxiii. 28) *for the treasures, &c.* which are governed by *lamed.—The dedicated things:* see chap. xxvi. 26.—V. 13. לכל continuation of לאוצרות in the previous verse: *for the treasures—and for the divisions of the priests—and for the whole work—and for all the vessels,* &c. We might regard these words as a continuation of לחצרות and לכל־הלשכות in the foregoing verse, and explain them thus: "David gave him the pattern of the divisions, of the entire work," &c., the meaning of which would be, he gave him instructions with reference to the divisions, &c.; but this would be an arbitrary explanation. —V. 14. Continuation of v. 14 *(all instruments):* he gave him the pattern *of the golden* (the golden articles chap. xxix. 2) *according to the weight for the golden, for all* (golden) *articles of every kind of service, and* (he gave him the pattern) *of all the silver articles according to the weight for all articles of every kind of service.*—V. 15. *The weight;* accusative of the objects governed by "he gave" in v. 11. *And for their golden lamps, according to the weight of every single candlestick, and of its lamps,* (and similarly the fol-

lowing words:) he gave him the weight *of the silver candlesticks according to weight for each particular candlestick and its lamps according to the service* (as the service required) *of each particular candlestick.*—V. 16. *He gave him the gold by weight for the tables of shewbread.* In other passages we read of only *one table of shewbread* (Ex. xxv. 23 sqq.; 1 Kings vii. 48; and even 2 Chr. xxix, 18), but here there are said to have been several. According to 2 Chr. iv. 8 Solomon had ten tables made, probably for the ten golden candlesticks (1 Kings vii. 49), but these could not be described as שלחנות המערכת. If, however, according to the author's own account in 2 Chr. xxix. 18 there was only *one* table of shewbread in Solomon's temple, the words before us must be regarded as containing a general expression, intended to include the table of shewbread and the rest of the tables (see Josephus Antiq. viii. 3, 7). *And silver for the silver tables;* these are only mentioned here, and we have no information in the Old Testament as to the purpose to which they were applied. The Rabbins are of opinion that they stood in the forecourt, and that the flesh of the sacrificial animals was laid upon them.—V. 17. Before the first three words it is most natural to supply from v. 11 the words: he gave him the form *of the forks, &c.* On the first two words cf. Ex. xxvii. 3. ולכפורי, he gave him the pattern *of the golden pitchers according to weight* (v. 15) *for each particular pitcher;* the pitchers here referred to were probably pitchers with lids, they are also noticed in Ezra i. 10, and viii. 27. V. 18. *And he gave the pattern of the altar of incense of refined gold according to the weight.* At the close of the account the accusative תבנית is repeated from v. 11, and, on account of the distance at which it stands from its verb, is marked as an accusative by the preposition *lamed: he gave the pattern of the chariot of the cherubim of gold.* The word cherubim is in apposition to chariots; the cherubim are the chariots on which God rides or is enthroned (Ps. xviii. 11, xcix. 1; Ex. xxv. 22); it is true that Ezekiel speaks of wheels on which the throne of God rests (Ezek. i. 26), and which are seen beside the cherubim (v. 15 sqq., cf. Ecclus. xlix. 8), and in accordance with this the Septuagint renders the passage before us καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ ἅρματος τῶν χερουβίμ. The Vulgate calls to mind still more decidedly the four cherubim of Ezekiel by the words *quadriga cherubim*, but in the figures above the ark of the covenant there was no representation of a

chariot drawn by the cherubim, nor is there anything to suggest this idea in the passage under consideration. פרשים without the article, and with the preposition *lamed*, is quite unintelligible, the two participles פרשים and סכבים, as we may clearly see from 2 Chr. v. 8, Ex. xxv. 20, 1 Kings viii. 7, must stand in apposition to *haccerubim*, and hence the passage should read הַפֹּרְשִׂים וְהַסֹּכְכִים, *which spread out* their wings and *cover over the ark of the covenant of Jehovah*; in both the Septuagint and Vulgate this rendering is adopted. The words do not admit of any other explanation; yet even assuming that the *lamed* is prefixed in the loosest possible manner, the reading of the text cannot be made to yield this sense. The supposition, that לפרשים might mean *ut essent expandentes* sc. *alas suas* (*J. H. Michaelis*), merely hides the difficulty, but does not remove it. V. 19 בכתב מיד יהוה עלי, these words are closely connected together (cf. *al* in chap. xi. 10; Judg. xix. 20; Neh. ii. 8, 18): *by a writing from the hand of Jehovah upon me, i.e.* by a writing which was given to me as a rule. The nominative to the verb "taught," can only be Jehovah, which can easily be supplied from the expression "hand of Jehovah." The suffix in עָלַי refers to David, whose words are introduced here as in chap. xxiii. 4 seq. without any further notice. Thus David says: *all this has Jehovah taught me through a writing from Jehovah's hand given to me as a rule, all the works of the pattern, &c., i.e.* all these works that have not yet been carried out; and the תבנית or design of which has been already described in the previous verses. A writing from the hand of Jehovah is a writing containing a divine revelation; as in 2 Chr. xxix. 15 the command by the hand of Jehovah is equivalent to the command by the hand of the prophets, so the writing by the hand of Jehovah may here mean a writing drawn up by divine direction. But as the description of the sacred objects in Ex. xxv. sqq. evidently forms the groundwork of that contained in these verses, we are led to the conclusion that by "the writing from the hand of Jehovah," we are to understand the law of Moses. To this law David appeals, as a proof that he had not invented the models of the sacred buildings and objects which floated before his spirit (v. 12) in an arbitrary manner, just as Josiah in making his arrangements appealed to a writing of David and his son Solomon (2 Chr. xxxv. 4). Hence we find in this a reference to a sacred writing, or, to use the expression employed by

the Jews in very early times to the תורה שבכתב, the law in the Scripture. (*Keil* [p. 318] regards this as an announcement of a special revelation, "Just as the Lord had formerly shown to Moses the pattern of the tabernacle [Ex. xxv. 40, xxvi. 30] so did he also make known by revelation to David the pattern of the temple and its furniture.") The whole section from vv. 11—19 gives prominence to the fact that David not only made preparation for the building of the temple by collecting materials, &c., but that he gave to Solomon definite directions for completing the erection and constructing the sacred vessels, and that in doing this he did not follow his own ideas or adopt arbitrary plans, but was guided by divine revelation. The temple of Solomon was concluded after the model of the Mosaic sanctuary; for the ancient sanctuary of Moses God himself had given the measures and the plans (Ex. xxv. sqq.); David followed these divine plans and measures, when he gave directions to Solomon for the building of the temple. In the Books of Kings no mention is made of this. David was not permitted to build the temple, but he had carried out the preparations to such an extent that in the fourth year of his reign Solomon was able to commence the building, and in the eleventh it was complete (1 Kings vi.).

Vv. 20, 21. The address to Solomon, which was broken off at v. 10, is here resumed. V. 20. On the exhortation in the former part of the verse, cf. chap. xxii. 13.—V. 21. "And behold," this exclamation refers to the divisions of the priests and Levites, who are to be regarded as having taken part in the large assembly, although not specially named. נדיב בחכמה only occurs here; נדיב generally denotes one who brings freewill offerings, here one who is ready with wisdom for every service; the skilful workmen and artists, mentioned in chap. xxii. 15, 2 Chr. ii. 6, who were ready to assist in the building of the temple, are here referred to. The combination of the words נדיב and חכמה was probably suggested by Ex. xxxv. 5, 22, and xxxvi. 1. The *lamed* before כל נדיב is very remarkable, standing as it does in the middle of the sentence: *and with me in every work are all volunteers with wisdom*; hence we cannot set it down as a *lamed* of introduction, meaning, "so far as all the volunteers are concerned," for, however freely it might be used in a con-

tinued narrative (chap. xxix. 6), it could hardly stand in the middle of a sentence. Instead of *lamed* the Septuagint has the *vav copul.* which is also unsuitable; we cannot discover upon what text the Vulgate is based. We must decide to read כל instead of לכל; the latter could easily be written for the former through a mere error of the pen, as *l'col* occurs just before and twice immediately afterwards.

Chap. xxix. 1—5. *David asks for voluntary contributions towards the building of the temple,* just as Moses had formerly asked the Israelites for freewill offerings for the tabernacle and its furniture (Ex. xxv. 1—8).—V. 1. The parenthetical clause "*when God hath chosen him alone,*" is to be regarded as a relative and explained in this manner: Solomon, whom alone God hath chosen, is young and tender, but though he is young and tender, still he must undertake the great work, for God has chosen him and no other. On the expression, "young and tender," see chap. xxii. 5. בירה, a great building, generally used to denote the palace or the residence of the Persian kings (Esther i. 2, 5, ii. 3, 8; Neh. i. 1); this is the only passage in which it is applied to the magnificent temple (in Neh. ii. 8, the castle by the side of the temple is meant). The word is only met with in the Chronicles and in Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel; and in the singular is always written with the article.—V. 2. cf. chap. xxii. 14. *The gold for the golden; i.e.,* for the vessels and ornaments of gold, v. 5, chap. xxviii. 14.—אבני שהם ומלואים (אבני פוך according to Ex. xxv. 7, xxviii. 9, xxxv. 9); probably stones of a black and brilliant colour, like the Stibium and the black colour prepared from it; in Is. liv. 4, 11, *puk* is mentioned as a costly cement. The אבני רקמה were probably stones with veins of different colours. אבן יקרה, according to 2 Chr. iii. 6, was for decorating the walls. שיש, which we only meet with in Esther i. 6, Song of Solomon v. 15, and here, is rendered *Parian marble* in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate.*—V. 3. *And moreover with my love to the house of Jehovah, I have a treasure of silver and gold, I shall have given it* (the perfect to denote a fixed resolution) *to the house of God over and above all that I have prepared for the holy house;* בל in the construct state before the verb הכינותי, which is added without the relative pronoun; cf. chap. xv. 12.—V. 4. Three thousand

talents of gold are about ninety million thalers (£13,500,000); seven thousand talents of silver, about eighteen million thalers (£2,700,000); an amount nearly equal to the bullion in the Bank of England (cf. chap. xxii. 14). *The houses;* cf. chap. xxviii. 11.—V. 5. *of gold,* cf. v. 2.

Vv. 6—9. *The princes cheerfully follow the example set by David and obey his exhortation.*—V. 6. *Princes of the fathers,* in other places *heads of the fathers* (chap. xxiv. 31, xxvii. 1).—ולשרי מלאכת, the *lamed* is not rendered in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate,* still we are not warranted in erasing it from the text, as the introductory *lamed (and as regards the princes of the king)* is probably selected here for the purpose of laying greater emphasis upon those who are mentioned last in the series. The princes referred to here are those whose names are given in chap. xxvii. 25—31.—V. 7. *Ten thousand darics;* the word אדרכנים only occurs here and at Ezra viii. 27; in Ezra ii. 69 and Neh. vii. 70 sqq. we have דַּרְכְּמוֹנִים. Are we to understand it as denoting a δραχμή or a δαρεικός? *Darcemonim* certainly reminds us of a δραχμή, the other word, which can hardly be a mere abbreviation of Darkemon, does not bear the least resemblance to δραχμή. In the versions it is not rendered by δραχμή, but by a word denoting a current coin, in the *Septuagint* by χρυσοῦς, in the *Vulgate* by *solidos;* at Ezra viii. 27, the Syriac has ܕܪܟܡܘܢ, in which we can recognise at once the Greek δαρεικός. This leads us to decide in favour of the rendering *daric,* for we are warranted in attaching the greatest importance to the fact that in the *Syriac* the word is associated with the daric, which was current in the cis-Asiatic countries long after the fall of the Persian empire. To this we may add the Jewish traditions, according to which the *Adarcon,* or darcon as it is called in the Talmud, was a *Persian* gold coin (cf. *Buxtorf* lex. chald.). The historian employed the word by which the gold coin current in his time was commonly known, not with the idea that darics existed in the time of David, but to set before his readers in the most intelligible manner the magnitude of the amount contributed by the princes.—V. 8. הנמצא אתו may be thus resolved according to Gen. xliv. 9: ואיש אשר נמצא אתו *and every one with whom there was found,* but this solution does not suit either the plural, which immediately follows, אבנים, or the plural נתנו. The

suffix in אִתּוֹ, being a neuter, must be referred to the metals previously mentioned, so that we might render it "*along with it*;" אֲבָנִים is an Accusative governed by the perfect Niphal נִמְצָא, and the demonstrative דְּ before the verb takes the place of the relative prononn (cf. v. 17): *and whatever was found along with it in stones they* gave, &c. The princes of David's time, like those of the time of Moses (Ex. xxxv. 27), brought precious stones as freewill offerings. The gifts were delivered to *Jehiel*, to the Levitical family, which had been entrusted with the oversight of the treasures of the house of Jehovah (cf. chap. xxvi. 21 seq.), —V. 9. *With perfect heart*; see chap. xxviii. 9.

Vv. 10—19. *David thanks God for the readiness with which the people brought the gifts, which they had received from God, and offered them for the building of the temple.*—V. 10. *God of Israel our father*; cf. v. 18, God of Abraham . . . . our fathers, and v. 20, Jehovah the God of their fathers.—V. 11. After כִּי we must supply לְךָ: *yea to thee belongeth every thing in heaven and on earth.* From the word לְךָ we must take the pronoun אַתָּה, which is required by the last words of the verse: (thou art he *who raisest thyself as head above every thing*;) מִתְנַשֵּׂא, with a reflective signification as in Num. xvi. 3, and chap. xxiii. 24.—V. 12. מִלְּפָנֶיךָ; and the kingdom and the glory (Prov. iii. 16) come *from thee*.—V. 13. *We thank thee*; the participle with the pronoun is used in the same sense as our present; in other cases the perfect occurs with the same meaning (*e.g.*, Ps. lxxv. 2); the expression in this verse is not met with anywhere else.—V. 14. The words עָצַר כֹּחַ, *to retain strength, to have strength*, are only used in Daniel and the Chronicles (2 Chr. ii. 5, xiii. 20, xxii. 9; and in the same sense without the noun in 2 Chr. xiv. 10, xx. 37). —*And from thy hand*; equivalent to "and what has been received from thee *we have given to thee*."—V. 15. For the first half of the verse compare Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19. *As the shadow are our days on the earth* (Job viii. 9), *there being no hope* (Ezra x. 2), of a continuance of life. V. 16. The Kethib הִיא is to be considered as a neuter: from thy hand *it is*; the Keri has the masculine הוּא agreeing with הֲמוֹן. V. 17. *Who are present here*; the demonstrative for the relative (v. 8, chap. xxvi. 28); the plural, who *are* found here, points back to the collective noun *people*.

Instead of the perfect we find the participle in 2 Chr. v. 11. V. 18. The accusative זאת is more precisely defined by the repeated accusative ליצר: Keep *this* for ever, namely *the imagination of the thoughts* (chap. xxviii. 9) *of the heart of thy people, i.e.* preserve these thoughts and this disposition, which have shown themselves in the voluntary contributions of such rich presents for thy house. In the continuation the accusative is pointed out by the *lamed* before יצר, *And established their heart unto thee;* cf. 1 Sam. vii. 3. V. 19. *And that he may do all;* viz., all thy commandments, testimonies, and statutes (chap. xxii. 13, xxviii. 7). אשר an accusative before הבינותי, *the building, which I have prepared;* in other cases (*e.g.* vv. 2 and 3) we have הבינותי לבית, and should accordingly expect to have לאשר here.

Vv. 20—25. *Conclusion of the assembly. Solomon is made king of Israel.* V. 20. *And bowed and worshipped;* in Ex. iv. 31, Gen. xliii. 28, 2 Chr. xxix. 30, Neh. viii. 6, these words are used to denote the adoration of God and prostration before him, but here they are also applied to the reverence shown to David the king (cf. 1 Kings i. 31, where the same expression occurs with reference to David). V. 21. After the solemn conclusion of the assembly, which David had convened, the people still remained together; on the following day they sacrificed as a burnt-offering *a thousand oxen, a thousand rams, a thousand sheep, with the appropriate drink-offerings,* and in addition to all this, *thank-offerings* (זבחים, in antithesis to עלות, were the sacrificial animals, which were offered as *thank-offerings,* and of which only certain portions were burned upon the altar, the priests receiving the breast and the right thigh, and the rest of the meal being eaten by the offerers and other persons invited by them) *in abundance for the whole of Israel, i.e.* every Israelite being allowed to take part in the joyous, sacrificial meal. V. 22. Those who shared in the sacrificial meal *ate and drank before Jehovah that day* (viz., on the day on which the burnt-offerings and thank-offerings were sacrificed); *then they made Solomon king a second time, and anointed him before Jehovah as prince* (1 Kings i. 35), *and Zadok* (לצדוק is an accusative, like Solomon just before) *as high priest. The second time;* the account contained in 1 Kings i., where David commands Zadok the high priest to anoint Solomon king,

and Zadok obeys this command, is very briefly referred to by the historian in chap. xxiii. 1, where he makes use of the expression, "*David made Solomon king over Israel;*" hence this is to be regarded as the *first* time, to which the historian here refers. *And anointed him;* 2 Sam. ii. 4, v. 3. The words, "*and they anointed Zadok as high priest,*" imply that under Solomon Zadok filled the office of high priest with a cheerful assent on the part of the people, and this is confirmed by a comparison of 1 Kings i. 32, ii. 26 sqq. V. 23. *On the throne of Jehovah* (cf. chap. xxviii. 5); this verse appears to be merely an expansion of 1 Kings ii. 12. V. 24. נתן יד תחת (cf. 2 Chr. xxx. 8) *to submit.* V. 25. *And he laid on him the glory of the kingdom, which had not been upon any king over Israel before him,* a singular expression, as there had been no kings *before* Solomon except Saul and David; compare on the other hand 2 Chr. i. 12, "*before thee and after thee,*" also 1 Kings iii. 12.

V. 26—30. *Conclusion of the history of David.* V. 26. *Over all Israel, vid.* chap. xi. 1, xii. 38. V. 27. Almost word for word the same as 1 Kings ii. 11. *Seven years;* according to 2 Sam. v. 5, the exact time was seven years and six months. V. 30. (The acts of David behold they are written . . . . .) *together with his kingdom, and his might and the times* (or as we might say for the sake of greater clearness together with the events of his reign) *which passed over him and over Israel and over all the kingdoms of the lands;* the kingdoms of the lands are spoken of again in 2 Chr. xii. 8, xvii. 10, xx. 29; cf. Ezra ix. 7, "the kings of the lands." By the kingdoms of the lands we are of course to understand only the kingdoms with which the Israelites under David came in contact, *e.g.* the kingdoms of Edom, Moab, and Aram Zobah.

SECOND BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES.

II. Chap. i.—Chap. ix.

HISTORY OF SOLOMON.

After an account of the sacrifice in Gibeon and the appearance of God at that place (chap. i. 1—13), and after some passing notices respecting Solomon's chariots, horsemen, and riches (ch. i. 14—17), our historian proceeds at once to describe the building and consecration of the temple (chap. i. 18—vii.). Then follow some brief remarks with reference to other buildings erected by Solomon, the tributary service enforced for that purpose (chap. viii. 1—10), and the house which he built for Pharoah's daughter (v. 11); also concerning the worship of God and arrangements connected therewith (vv. 12—16); and lastly the voyage to Ophir (vv. 17, 18). The account of the visit of the queen of Sabaea forms an introduction to the description of Solomon's wealth and glory (chap. ix. 1—28), which is followed by a notice of his death and burial (vv. 29—31).

1. Chap. i. 1—13.

SOLOMON OFFERS BURNT OFFERINGS IN GIBEON; IN THE NIGHT AFTER THE SACRIFICE GOD APPEARS TO HIM.

Vv. 1—6. *The solemn procession to Gibeon, where Solomon offered sacrifice upon the altar of burnt-offering, which had been handed down from the time of Moses.* cf. 1 Kings iii. 4.—V. 1.

וַיִּתְחַזֵּק, an expression frequently met with in the Chronicles (cf. Chap. xii. 13, xiii. 21, xxi. 4); here it is followed by the words "over his kingdom," in chap. xvii. 1 by "over Israel;" *he achieved for himself a firm government over his kingdom. And Jehovah his God was with him* (a similar expression in 1 Chr. xi. 9) *and he made him very great* (cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 5, xxix. 25).—V. 2 seq. It is not expressly stated in 1 Kings iii. 4 that Solomon went to Gibeon accompanied by the princes, &c., but it is *a priori* probable that he offered his numerous sacrifices in Gibeon in the presence of his princes and in a large assembly of the people. According to the verses before us, he summoned the princes and representatives of the congregation, in the same manner as David had called them together on similar occasions (1 Chr. xiii. 1 seq., xxiii. 2, xxviii. 1). *He spake to all Israel* (namely) *to the princes of the thousands and the hundreds and to the judges and all the princes, to all Israel* (namely) *the heads of the fathers'-houses.* Before רֹאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת we must supply *lamed* from the previous verse. The historian states emphatically, that "speaking to all Israel" meant speaking to the princes and representatives of the congregation. What Solomon said to them is not communicated; according to the context and the analogy of 1 Chr. xiii. 2 seq. we must assume that he summoned the assembled congregation to accompany him to Gibeon.—*To the high place which is in Gibeon, for here was the tabernacle of God, which Moses the servant of Jehovah had prepared in the desert* (cf. 1 Chr. v. 30—41); before this tabernacle on the high place at Gibeon, Zadok the high-priest and the priests under him fulfilled the duties of their office in accordance with the law of Moses (1 Chr. xvi. 39 seq.).—V. 4. But the ark of the covenant was not in the tabernacle, was it? *Undoubtedly* (אַבָל is used to confirm a statement which is made unexpectedly or likely to excite questions and doubts, chap. xix. 3, xxxiii. 17; 1 Kings i. 43) *David had brought up the ark from Kirjath-Jearim* (cf. 1 Chr. xiii. 6) *to the place which David had prepared* (instead of הֵכִין לוֹ the earlier rules of the language would have required בַּאֲשֶׁר הֵכִין לוֹ, cf. Judg. v. 27; Ruth i. 5, or בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר הֵכִין לוֹ, cf. 1 Kings xxi. 19; but we are not justified in taking the words just mentioned from the Book of Kings, as *Thenius*

suggests, and substituting them for the reading in the text, since the demonstrative frequently takes the place of the relative in the Chronicles (cf. 1 Chr. xxvi. 28), and we even meet with relative clauses connected directly with a preposition without any intervening pronoun, cf. 1 Chr. xv. 12), *for he had pitched a tent for it in Jerusalem* (1 Chr. xv. 1), *but* (v. 5) *the brazen altar . . . was there before the dwelling place of Jehovah,* and as this altar, which from time immemorial had been set apart for burnt-offerings, stood in Gibeon, that was the place in which according to the law burnt-offerings were to be sacrificed. As the historian here expressly states that Solomon offered the burnt offerings at the place of worship appointed in the law, he explains, on the other hand, that it was only by extraordinary events and special signs from God that David could be induced to sacrifice at the altar which he had erected on the threshing-floor of Ornan; and he also describes the manner in which David was hindered from offering his burnt sacrifice at Gibeon. *The brazen altar which Bezalel ben Uri ben Hur had made;* see Ex. xxxi. 2 and 9, where the altar of burnt-offering, *i.e.,* the brazen altar, is expressly mentioned among the things to be made by Bezalel and Oholiab (cf. chap. xxxvii. 1 and xxxviii. 1 sqq.) Instead of שָׁם most MSS. and many editions have the pointing שָׂם *he had placed;* the latter reading is adopted in the Targum and Syriac. But the former pointing is also found in many MSS. and very many editions, including most of the old ones of the 16th century; this reading was also adopted in the Septuagint and Vulgate. It is at once apparent that the reading שָׁם *thither, there,* is more suitable to the context. If the Masoretes preferred the other, they were probably induced to do so by Ex. xl. 29.—וידרשהו; the suffix does not refer to the altar, but to the word Jehovah which immediately precedes the verb (cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 30; 2 Chr. xv. 2).—V. 6. *On the brazen altar before Jehovah;* before Jehovah, because it stood before the dwelling place of Jehovah, Ex. xl. 6.—*Which belongs to the tabernacle;* the golden altar, on the other hand, belonged to the Debir, according to 1 Kings vi. 22, because its place had been assigned it in front of the Debir. אשר ל denotes here, as elsewhere, *which belongs to,* and is perfectly intelligible, although אשר לפני might be used

instead, both here and in 1 Kings vi. 22, because, as a necessary consequence of belonging to *the tabernacle* or *the debir*, the altar stood *before it.* ויעל, at the commencement of the verse, is separated from its object by several intervening words, and hence it is repeated at the end of the verse in immediate connection with the object. In verses 2—6, which have all the marks of the authorship of our historian, we have an expansion and explanation of the brief statement in 1 Kings iii. 4.

Vv. 7—12. *The appearance of God.* See the commentary on 1 Kings iii. 5—15.

V. 13. *Return to Jerusalem* (cf. 1 Kings iii. 15). Instead of לבמה, which earlier expositors accounted for on the supposition that we have an ellipsis here *(and Solomon came,* after his journey *to the height in Gibeon, to Jerusalem)*, we must follow the Septuagint and Vulgate and read מֵהַבָּמָה. The words which follow (*"from before the tabernacle"*) require this reading. The clause at the end of this narrative, from which we learn that *"from the height in Gibeon"* is equivalent to *"from before the tabernacle,"* is added for the purpose of calling attention once more to the sacredness of the place of sacrifice in Gibeon and the legal validity of the sacrifices offered there. In the parallel passage (1 Kings iii.) it is still further stated that after Solomon's arrival in Jerusalem he offered burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and prepared a feast before the ark of the covenant. Our historian passes this over in silence, certainly not because he regarded the offerings presented on the old brazen altar of burnt-offering before the ancient tabernacle as *alone* possessing validity, for, according to his own account (1 Chr. xxi.), God himself had selected a place of sacrifice in Jerusalem as early as the time of David, and in these verses he appears to mention the tabernacle in Gibeon for the purpose of explaining to his readers what it was that induced Solomon to offer the solemn sacrifice in Gibeon and not in Jerusalem, as the precedent established by David would lead us to expect. He passes over the sacrifice in Jerusalem, and the dispute between the two women, related in 1 Kings iii. 16—28, which furnished Solomon with an opportunity of displaying the wisdom conferred upon him by God, because he was desirous of confining himself to that which had taken place at Gibeon. The narrative is brought to its proper close in

the words "*he came to Jerusalem*," which correspond to the clause in v. 3, "*they went to the high place at Gibeon*." The further remark, "*and he reigned over Israel*," appears superfluous; in the Syriac we find "over *all* Israel," and the same words occur in 1 Kings iv. 1. It is probable that this was the original reading; the word *col* after *al* may easily have been dropped from the text. There is nothing superfluous in the remark that Solomon ruled over *all* Israel, even after the statement contained in v. 1. But it would be more appropriate to take it as the commencement of a new paragraph (vv. 14—18), which is the position assigned it in 1 Kings iv. It was probably connected with the thirteenth verse on the occasion of the division of the verses, in consequence of the word ויאסף (v. 14) being regarded as the opening of a fresh verse and section, as in 1 Kings x. 26.

2. Chap. i. 14—17.

SOLOMON'S CHARIOTS, HORSEMEN, AND WEALTH.

We find these verses almost word for word in 1 Kings x. 26—29; see the commentary on that passage.

3. Chap. ii.—vii.

THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE AND OTHER THINGS CONNECTED WITH IT.

Chap. ii. 1—17. *Preparations for the building of the temple.*

Chap. ii., v. 1. ויאמר, *and Solomon commanded*, is followed by the infinitive with *lamed*: *that they should build*, cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 17. The temple is called *a house for the name of Jehovah*, because his name, *i.e.*, He himself, dwelt in the temple with that majesty and holiness, which are most concisely designated His Name (Deut. xxviii. 58; 2 Chr. xx. 8, 9). The *house for his kingdom*, the royal palace, is merely mentioned incidentally in the Chronicles, here and at chap. ii. 11, vii. 11, viii. 1; we have

full particulars respecting the erection of it in 1 Kings vii. 1—12. We agree in the main with the result of Thenius' enquiries, that the greater part of this palace was on the higher plateau of Zion, on its north-eastern side, and that the eastern side of the palace was opposite to the western side of the temple.

V. 2. The statements contained in this verse we meet with again at v. 18, where they are repeated in close connection with v. 17. The historian evidently did not strictly confine himself to his original sources. He introduced at this point a remark which occurred later in the sources themselves, and afterwards copied them more fully, thus repeating what he had already written. See vv. 17 and 18.

Vv. 3—16. *Negotiations with Huram king of Tyre.*—Vv. 3—10. Solomon first applies to Huram (differently narrated in 1 Kings v.) in writing, as we may infer from v. 11.—V. 3. The name *Huram* only occurs in the Chronicles; in 1 Kings v. 15 he is called *Hiram*, in vii. 40 and other places *Hirom*. Hirom appears to resemble most closely the original form, as we find the same name written Εἴρωμος in *Menander*, as quoted by *Josephus* (c. Apion i. 18, 21), for which Σίρωμος occurs in *Herodotus* 7, 98 and Syncellus p. 344 Ed. Bonn. *Josephus* himself writes Εἴραμος (Antiq. viii. 2).—The words *to build him a house* occur again in 1 Chr. xiv. 1. The expression "*as thou didst deal &c.*" requires another clause, which should read thus: *deal also with me*, but these words can easily be supplied from the context, especially from v. 6, though the Vulgate translators have thought it necessary to interpolate, *sic fac mecum*!—V. 4. *To consecrate it* (the temple) *to him, i.e.*, to make it קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה, Lev. xxvii. 14. The expression is more closely defined by the following infinitive: for the purpose *of burning incense*, &c. The *sweet smelling incense* (Ex. xxv. 6) was the regular incense, that was burned every morning and every evening (Ex. xxx. 7 seq.) The מַעֲרֶכֶת תָּמִיד was *laid* on the table of showbread (cf. Ex. xxv. 30), hence the infinitive לְהַקְטִיר does not refer to the continual offering of the showbread. The *laied* alone must be applied to the latter part of the sentence, thus: for *the continual offering and for the burnt sacrifice*. Burnt sacrifices had to be offered every morning and evening, and in addition to this continual burnt-offering special sacrifices were offered according to the law on

the Sabbaths, the new moons, and the feast days (Num. xxviii. and xxix.). The concluding words remind us of the well known formula "for a statute for ever" (*e.g.* Num. xix. 10); they are quite loosely connected, and form a sentence by themselves: *for all time this is enjoined upon Israel.* Earlier expositors interpreted the sentence in its present connexion as meaning: it is therefore important to build a fixed and permanent temple, because the sacrificial worship therein is to last for ever, and therefore I require building materials; but in this explanation they laid too much stress upon so loosely constructed a clause; compare the similar words in 1 Chr. xxiii. 31. V. 5. In 1 Chr. xxix. 1 all that was said was, the temple must be great, because it is not for man but for God; but here the reason is still more strongly expressed: it must be great, because it is intended for the God, who is greater than all gods (Ex. xviii. 11). V. 6. *Who is able;* cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 14. The words "*for the heaven and the heaven of heavens do not contain him,*" are a reminiscence of 1 Kings viii. 27, and 2 Chr. vi. 18, where we find the sentence appropriately completed thus: *to say nothing of this house which I have built.* In the question "*Who am I, that I should build him a house*" (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 14) there is implied: a house for him to dwell in I cannot build; and with this is connected the antithesis: *but only for the purpose of burning incense before him, i.e.,* only to maintain a place in which God may be honoured by sacrifice, can I venture to build him a house. V. 7. The *wise man to work in gold, &c.,* who is asked for here, is afterwards sent by King Huram (v. 11). The works of art and instruments prepared by this artificer are described in chap. iv. 11—16; but we do not find any mentioned in this list for which *purple cloth, crimson stuff,* or *blue purple* were required. *Purple stuff;* ארגון, equivalent to ארגמן v. 13, Ex. xxv. 4, was the usual form adopted in later times and in the Aramaean dialect; Dan. v. 7, 16, 29. *Crimson;* כרמיל was certainly not originally a Hebrew word; it was probably current among the Persians and Armenians, and came from them to the Hebrews along with the material to which it was applied; (cf. Gesenius thes. p. 714). *Blue purple,* frequently mentioned in Exodus, *e.g.* Chap. xxvi. 31. In 1 Kings vii. 13 the artificer is merely said to have been a worker in brass. If at the same time the various kinds of cloth are

mentioned, which were used in preparing the curtains in the temple, this is done simply for the purpose of comprising in one list all the costly materials which were required for the temple and its furniture. But we obtain the further information here, that the artist employed himself in weaving, which is not mentioned in the other passages. לפתח פתוחים, *to prepare carved ornaments*, see 1 Kings vi. 18, 23, 29. According to 1 Kings vii. 13, 2 Chr. iv. 11—16, the artist did not work in wood. Before עם החכמים (with the wise men) the infinitives לעשות and לפתח must be repeated thus: *that he may work*, &c. *along with the wise* men, &c. For the last words of the verse see 1 Chr. xxii. 15, xxviii. 21.—V. 8. For אלגומים, here and chap. ix. 10 seq., we find אלמגים in 1 Kings x. 11; the word denotes the genuine sandal-wood, which is said in the passages cited to have come to Palestine from the land of Ophir; according to 1 Kings v. 20 and 22, Hiram sent from Lebanon only cedar and cypress wood; the author of the Chronicles mentions in connexion with these the third valuable wood, which is also noticed in 1 Kings x. 12, as employed in the building of the temple, but which did not come from Lebanon. The last half of the verse corresponds very closely to the words of Solomon as reported in 1 Kings v. 20.—Ver. 9. The infinitive ולהכין cannot be regarded as a continuation of the words, *to cut*, in v. 8; it is rather connected with the imperative "send me" in v. 8, meaning "*and they shall prepare for me*;" on this use of the infinitive with *lamed* see 1 Chr. xxii. 5. והפלא, the infinitive absolute in this passage has the meaning of an adverb, *wonderfully*, cf. *Ewald*, Lehrbuch 280 c.—V. 10. The word לחטבים, which does not occur anywhere else in the Chronicles (cf. Josh. ix. 21, 23, 27), is explained by לכרתי העצים (the *lamed* is the introductory prefix); *and behold, as for the hewers, who cut down the trees, I give* (the perfect as in 1 Chr. xxix. 3) *wheat for food for thy servants*, viz. for those who were employed in felling trees (cf. *thy servants* in v. 7, and 1 Kings v. 20). מכות is quite unintelligible; the explanation *wheat of strokes*, or wheat that is beaten, threshed, cannot be correct, for the reference here is to measured wheat, which must necessarily have been threshed; nor can it be rendered, *wheat for strokes*, in other words for the felling of the trees, for מכות is connected with חטים in the

absolute state. According to 1 Kings v. 25 the reading should be מַכֹּלֶת (contracted from מַאֲכֹלֶת *food*); by mistake a *vav* was substituted for *lamed*, and hence the original word was changed into the reading of our text. For the *twenty kors of oil*, mentioned in 1 Kings v., we should read according to this passage *twenty thousand baths of oil*. There are also various other respects in which the account given here differs from that of 1 Kings v. 25. There it is arranged by treaty that Solomon shall give Hiram every year 20,000 kors of wheat, and 20,000 baths of oil, here we read of only one delivery; there the delivery is intended for *the house* of King Hiram, here it is said to have been applied to the maintenance of the wood-cutters.—(*Bertheau* regards these as discrepancies, not so *Keil* who says (p. 218, 219): "these differences show clearly that the two accounts contain partial extracts from more ancient sources, for they are not at variance with each other. . . . There is no discrepancy between the statement of the Chronicles, that Solomon promised to give to the people of Hiram 20,000 kors of wheat, &c., and that of Kings, that Hiram requested provisions for the maintenance of his court, and received them from Solomon every year; the two passages treat of different things, and each is the complement of the other, as most expositors have already observed (cf. *J. H. Michaelis* adnott. uberr. ad 2 Chr. ii. 9, and *Schulz* Schol. ad 1 Reg. v. 11). *Studuit uterque scriptor sacer*, says Michaelis, *ut lectori hoc insinuaret. Hinc scriptor libri Regum expresse addit*, 20,000 *illos coros tritici, et* 20 *coros olei concessos fuisse Chiramo pro domo sive familia ejus regia alenda. Scriptor vero libri Chron. triticum, hordeum, vinum ac oleum data dicit servis Hirami, et ne quis per servos aulicos ejus intelligat, addit caesoribus, ne hoc tantum, sed praeterea, excidentibus ligna, ut non possimus commode intelligere, nisi eos, qui in ipso Libano laborabant.* Solomon had promised to give to the Tyrian workmen the provisions mentioned in the Chronicles; in addition to this Hiram required in return for the cedars, which he sent him, a *yearly* supply of wine and oil for his court, and according to the book of Kings Solomon delivered it." *Keil Chron.* p. 218, 219).—Vv. 12—16. King Hiram's answer. V. 11. *Because Jehovah loved his people*, &c.; Similar words occur in chap. ix. 8; 1 Kings x. 9.—V. 12. The fresh commencement וַיֹּאמֶר "*and he said*" may be explained from

the fact that in 1 Kings v. 21 the word is also found at the opening of a clause, which corresponds pretty closely with the words of the verse before us.—V. 13. יֹדֵעַ בִּינָה, 1 Chr. xii. 32. The *lamed* before *Huram* is the sign of the Accusative; the name of the artist is given in 1 Kings vii. 13 as *Hiram*, for which we have here *Huram*, just as King Hiram is called Huram in the Chronicles, cf. v. 2 of this chapter. The king calls the artist *my father;* father is here to be taken in the sense of master, as we may see from 2 Chr. iv. 16, where Huram is called the father of Solomon, because he was engaged as master in Solomon's service and prepared for him different works of art. Compare the word father in Gen. xlv. 8.—V. 14. According to 1 Kings vii. 14 the mother of the artist was a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, whereas in the passage before us she is said to have belonged to the daughters of Dan, *i.e.*, to the tribe of Dan. In order to reconcile these different statements early scholars, following *Kimchi* and other Rabbins, have maintained that in 1 Kings it is Hiram himself, and not his mother who is said to have belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, and that the actual state of the case accordingly was, that through his father he was connected with the tribe of Naphtali, whilst his mother belonged to the tribe of Dan. When the father is called a man of Tyre, the reason of this is said to have been simply that he lived in Tyre and was employed as an artist there. This explanation served also to remove the offence, which was taken by the Jews of a later age, at the Tyrian descent of the maker of the sacred vessels. But in 1 Kings it is clearly stated that he was the son of a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, and just as clearly is it stated both there and in the verse before us that he was a Tyrian man, *i.e.*, that Tyre was his native place, for the two expressions "*of the tribe of Naphtali*" (or "*of the daughters of Dan*"), and "*a Tyrian man*," are placed side by side as both indicative of the home and descent alone. *Thenius* thinks it possible to reconcile the different accounts of Huram thus: "he was the son of a Tyrian, who had married an Israelitish widow of the city of Dan in the tribe of Naphtali (which was very near to the city of Tyre)." But we know of no city of Dan in the province of Naphtali, and we certainly are not warranted in assuming the existence of such a city for the purpose of explain-

ing how the mother of Huram could belong to the daughters of Dan and be at the same time a Naphtalite. The question, whether we are justified in expecting exact historical statements in both passages, we have no hesitation in answering in the affirmative, since the person referred to was a celebrated man, about whom the Israelites, who had occasion to admire his works of art, must necessarily have been anxious to possess exact information. We must therefore attempt to unite these apparently discrepant accounts, since there is no reason to question the accuracy of either. Now it seems to us an important point, that the mother is called in 1 Kings a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, whereas in the Chronicles it is merely said that she belonged to the daughters of Dan. The two accounts are related to each other in the following manner: she was by birth a Danite, married into the tribe of Naphtali, became a widow, and as a widow of the tribe of Naphtali became the wife of a man of Tyre, by whom she had a son Huram. Thus could two of the tribes of Israel boast that on the mother's side Huram belonged to them. אִישׁ צרי, Septuagint ἀνὴρ Τύριος; צרי has been changed by *Josephus* (Antiq. 8. 3. 4) into "*Urias of an Israelitish family*," an alteration which can be traced to the desire to make Huram a man of purely Israelitish descent. יודע must be referred to Huram, for he was the skilful man for whom Solomon had just applied (v. 7). The skill of Huram, according to the verse before us, embraced working in *stone* and *wood*, and also the manufacture of *byssus*, articles not named in v. 7. The words "*to invent all kinds of clever devices*," here used to describe the skill of Huram, resemble Ex. xxxi. 4, cf. xxxv. 33. *Which are given to him* (*sc.*, to execute). The concluding words, "*along with thy wise men and the wise men of my lord David*" (cf. v. 7) are connected with the three infinitives, "*to work*," "*to grave*," and "*to invent*." By calling David, "*my lord*," king Huram politely places himself on a level with David's subjects (cf. 2 Sam. xvi. 9; 1 Kings i. 31).—V. 15 cf. 10. V. 16. *According to all thy need*; צרכך is found nowhere else in the Old Testament, but is frequently met with in the Aramæan writings, *e.g.*, the Targums (cf. *Buxtorf*, lex. chald. talmud. rabb.). The word רפסדות also occurs in this passage alone; in 1 Kings v. 23 we have דברות, which removes all doubt as to the meaning; *we will*

convey the wood to thee in floats (*raphsodoth* is a loosely connected accusative, explanatory of the mode of conveyance); we cannot succeed in finding any satisfactory etymology of this peculiar word. *To Joppa*, the nearest harbour to Jerusalem in the Mediterranean Sea; the name of the place is not given in 1 Kings v. 23. The letter of King Huram, as we have it here in v. 10—15, differs in many respects from the words of Huram in 1 Kings v. 21—23; at the same time it is very evident that the two passages relate to the same negotiations between the two kings. (See the commentary on the passage in Kings—Tr.). *Josephus* (Antiq. 8. 2. 6 seq.) also communicates the correspondence between Solomon and Hiram. The contents of these letters agree so exactly with the statements in 1 Kings v. that they must be regarded as freely worked up from the chapter in question. *Josephus* also says (Ant. 8. 2. 8.) that the *ἀντίγραφα* of the letters are not only to be found in the historical books of the Old Testament, but were still preserved in his day in the public archives of Tyre; but his words must not be taken in their strict literality so far as the Old Testament is concerned, since he does not give the letters in the form in which we have them there. And from this we may conclude, that his meaning is not that the letters still existed word for word in the Tyrian archives, but that accounts of the negotiations between Solomon and the King of Tyre were preserved in the Tyrian records in the same manner as in the Old Testament. There is no reason to question the credibility of this statement. "The letters from *Eupolemus* given by *Eusebius* (praepar. evang. ix. 33, 34) are evidently free compositions," *Thenius* on 1 Kings v. 23.

Vv. 17, 18. Recapitulation of the brief account in v. 1 (cf. 1 Kings v. 29 seq.). V. 17. "*All the foreigners*;" viz., the Canaanites, who lived in the midst of Israel (cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 2). *According to the numbering* (*sephar* only occurs in this passage) *wherewith David his father had numbered them*; in 1 Chr. xxii. 2 it is merely stated that David gave orders to *gather together* the foreigners, but as the object for which these foreigners were ordered to be collected together was that workmen might be obtained for the building of the temple, it is probable that this is the passage referred to here, and that this assembling of the foreigners in the time of David is what the author describes as

the first numbering. With this he now compares the second numbering in the time of Solomon. Moreover, it is evident, from the brief notice in 2 Sam. xx. 24, that in David's time the foreigners were obliged to perform tributary service under the superintendence of an officer, Adoram or Adoniram, and such regular service could not be carried out without a definite organisation and numbering of those who served. The number 153,600 is the sum total of the different numbers given in the next verse, 70,000, 80,000 and 3,600; hence the overseers were not included in this amount.—V. 18. The numbers 70,000 and 80,000 we meet with in v. 1, and 1 Kings v. 29. From a comparison with 1 Chr. xxii. 2 it is evident, that the seventy thousand *hewers on the mountain* were appointed to cut the stones for the building. According to *Thenius*, "*on the mountain*" meant on Mount Lebanon, but there is no intimation that this is intended even in 1 Kings v. 29 sqq., and it may be assumed at the outset, that at least the greater part of the stones used in the buildings at Jerusalem were procured from quarries in the neighbourhood; "*on the mountain*" is quite indefinite, and is merely equivalent to "at the quarries in the mountains." The word מְנַצְּחִים, denoting the overseers of the tributary labourers, is only met with in the Chronicles (here and v. 1, compare 2 Chr. xxxiv. 13). The number 3600 given here and at v. 1 is undoubtedly exact; 3600 × 50 = 180,000, the number which we obtain by adding to the 70,000 bearers of burdens and the 80,000 stone cutters the 30,000 tributary labourers mentioned in 1 Kings v. 27, who were employed in cutting wood upon the Lebanon. Thus there would be an overseer to every fifty men, which is clearly a very just proportion. The number 3300 given in 1 Kings v. 16 stands in no such relation to the whole number. *To keep the people at work*, an expression which is not found in the parallel passage in Kings (cf. Ex. vi. 5).—If we substitute 3600 for 3300, according to the account contained in this passage, the numbers given in 1 Kings v. 15, 16 correspond to those given here; but it is strange that nothing is said in this passage of the 30,000 hewers of wood mentioned in 1 Kings v. 13, especially as the number of the overseers, 3600, seems to have been fixed with reference to the whole number, including these 30,000. We cannot tell for what reason they are omitted here. On the

relation between the account given in these verses, and that contained in 1 Kings ix. 15—23, 2 Chr. viii. 7—10, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Chap. iii. 1—14. *The building of the temple.* Vv. 15—17. *The two pillars.*

Chap. iv. 1—10. *The holy things and the forecourts.* Vv. 11—18. *List of the brazen articles made by Huram.* Vv. 19—22. *The articles of gold.*

Chap. v. 1. *Conclusion of the account of the preparation of the holy things.*

Chap. v. 2—vii. 10. *Consecration of the temple.*

(For chap. iii. 1—vii. 10 the reader is referred to the Commentary on 1 Kings vi.—viii.—Tr.)

4. Chap. viii. and ix.

Brief notices of important events in Solomon's reign, account of his wisdom, his wealth, and his power, his death.

Vv. 1, 2. *Solomon peopled the cities, which Huram had given him, with Israelites;* compare 1 Kings ix. 10—14, where it is stated that Huram not only furnished Solomon with materials, but also assisted him with money (no doubt for the purpose of completing the great buildings), and that Solomon gave him in return twenty small cities in the neighbourhood of Tyre and its territory. Our historian says nothing about the assistance with gold, or the cities which Solomon gave to Huram; but speaks, on the other hand, of cities which Huram gave up to Solomon, and which the latter peopled with Israelites. Attempts were made in very early times to reconcile these two accounts. It was assumed that Solomon gave twenty cities to Huram, and that, as they did not seem to him a sufficient compensation, he gave them back to Solomon, who then peopled them with Israelites. This is the opinion expressed by Josephus (Antiq. 8. 5. 3). Jewish commentators *(e.g. Kimchi)* have conjectured that, in order to strengthen the alliance between Solomon and Huram, the former gave to the latter twenty cities, and Huram

again gave up to Solomon twenty others. In this way the earlier Christian commentators have combined the two. But it should be proved that the two accounts refer to different transactions, and this proof it would be difficult to furnish, as it is evident from a comparison of the accounts in the Book of Kings and the Chronicles, and their position in the two books, that the different statements rest upon the same original foundation. (*Keil* says, p. 221, 222:—"however contradictory the two accounts may appear at the first glance, the contradiction is only apparent and is removed by the remark that the one author relates what the other has omitted. Hiram had assisted Solomon with timber and gold. In return Solomon, as soon as his buildings were completed, gave up twenty cities which were under his dominion but were not inhabited by Israelites. Hiram went to look at them, but they did not please him. (So far 1 Kings ix. 11—13). He therefore gave them back to Solomon, who finished building them (for they were probably in very bad condition, and therefore did not please Hiram) and sent Israelites to dwell in them.[1] In this way *J. D. Michaelis*, in his notes on 2 Chr. viii. 2, has combined the two passages (cf. *Dahler* p. 86 *note a*). Still *Gramberg* pronounces them hopelessly irreconcileable, and says that there is something more than inconsistency in the statement of the author of the Chronicles, v. 2: that Solomon built the cities, &c., since it is impossible to tell how cities could be *built*, that were already in existence. But this remark does not indicate much shrewdness, for it presupposes, first of all, that nothing has happened in the world except the few events which have been recorded in history, and moreover it seems to show that *Gramberg* was ignorant of the fact that *banah* means also to *build up again, to finish building, restituere, instaurare, exstruere*, &c., meanings which may be found in every *lexicon*.")—V. 1. The time mentioned in 1 Kings is the same as that given here. The twenty years must be reckoned from the period when the building commenced. This statement is in harmony with the notices in 1 Kings vi. 38 (the temple was finished seven years after the commencement of the building) and with that in chap. vii. 1 (he

[1] On the situation of these cities see Ritter's Erdkunde B. 2 p. 384. This learned geographer also explains the two accounts in the manner indicated above, without discovering any discrepancy between them.

was building his own house thirteen years) cf. 2 Chr. v. 2.—*And his house*, cf. chap. i. 18.—V. 2. *The building* (according to v. 4 sqq. 1 Kings ix. 17 and other similar passages) must be understood as meaning the fortification of the cities. *And caused Israelites to dwell* (removed them) *thither*, 2 Kings xvii. 6.

V.v. 3—6. *The cities which Solomon built* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 17—19).—V. 3. The account of the conquest of the city, and, as appears from v. 4, of the kingdom of Hamath, whose king approached David in a friendly manner, and apparently ensured his independence by that means (cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 9—11), we find in this passage only. That the kingdom of Hamath was conquered by the Israelites is evident from 2 Kings xiv. 28; but this is the only passage in which we are informed that it was conquered by Solomon. On the name *Hamath Zobah* see 1 Chr. xviii. 3, 9.—*He went to* Hamath (sc. for the purpose of conquering it) cf. 2 Sam. xii. 29. חזק על is used in other passages to denote the conquest of countries or nations (chap. xxvii. 5; Dan. xi. 5).—V. 4. The building of Tadmor and all the store-cities in the land of Hamath is evidently connected with the conquest of the land of Hamath by Solomon, for after he had conquered this land he built Tadmor and the cities in the land of Hamath. From this, indeed, it does not follow that Tadmor was situated in the land of Hamath, but we may infer from the context that a connection was established with Tadmor through the conquest of Hamath, and thus the territory of Tadmor acquired greater importance for the Israelites. Hence we must look for Tadmor or Tammor (1 Kings ix. 18 Keri) outside Palestine, and somewhere towards the north-east. The identity of Tadmor (Tammor is certainly the original genuine Hebrew name, Tadmor a later Aramaean form) and Palmyra, which is established by tradition, is thus still farther confirmed. Palmyra was situated on the great line of traffic between the coast district of Palestine and Thapsakos on the Euphrates, and from its position became a very important place in connection with the traffic in the cis-Asiatic countries. It was *in the desert*, which stretches from Damascus to Thapsakos, in the centre of a fertile and well-watered plain, and was therefore very suitable for a place of call. In 1 Kings ix. 18 the name Tammor occurs in such a place in the list of cities mentioned there, as to suggest the notion that

the city referred to was in the south of Palestine, and therefore not Palmyra (*Thenius*); but the brief notice in the Book of Kings "*and Tammor in the desert in the land*," is evidently merely a supplementary remark, for an explanation of which we must look to the more complete account in the Chronicles. That the same city is referred to is evident from the definition בּמדבּר, "*in the desert*," and we are led to conjecture that the words "*in the land*" are the remains of a longer sentence, which could be completed from the passage before us in the following manner: "and all the store cities which he built *in the land*," namely in Hamath. As the words "*and all the store-cities*" occur again in the next verse, they might easily have been overlooked the first time. According to 2 Chr. xxxii. 28 *the store-cities* were places for collecting stores of provisions; when they were situated on the great trade-roads they were no doubt intended to relieve the wants of travellers and their beasts of burden.—V. 5. In 1 Kings ix. 17 lower Beth-horon only is mentioned. On the sites of the two Beth-horons see 1 Chr. vii. 24. ערי מצור must be regarded as a second accusative to the verb *banah: he built them as fortified towns* (chap. xi. 5); the words which follow are in apposition, and are added by way of explanation, namely, *as walls, gates, and bars* (cf. chap. xiv. 6).—V. 6. *Baalath* (1 Kings ix. 18) was a city in the tribe of Dan, Josh. xix. 44. It is appropriately named in connection with the fortified cities of Beth-horon, which were also to the west of Jerusalem. By the *store-cities* mentioned here we are to understand all, with the exception of those in Hamath, which had already been noticed in v. 4, but especially the store-cities in the land of Palestine. The *chariot-cities;* cf. chap. i. 14. In the other passages (chap. i. 14, ix. 25; 1 Kings x. 26) the cities of the horsemen are not specially mentioned, but the chariot-cities are described as stations for horsemen as well as for chariots. רכשׁ, as distinguished from the fortresses and store-cities, can only mean *pleasure-buildings*. —*And on the Lebanon* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 19).—It is worthy of note, that nothing is said in this passage about the fortification of Jerusalem, nor are the cities of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer named among the fortresses erected by Solomon (1 Kings ix. 15); the account of the conquest of Gezer by Pharaoh is also omitted (1 Kings ix. 16); cf. v. 11 below.

Vv. 7—10. *The institution of tributary service.* (See the commentary on 1 Kings ix. 20—23).—The question arises here, in what relation does the statement contained in these verses and in 1 Kings ix. 20—23 stand to the account given in 2 Chr. ii. 2 and 17, 18, and 1 Kings v. 27—32? If we had only to deal with 1 Kings v. 29—32, we should be warranted in saying without hesitation, that in this passage the reference is to labourers, who were taken from the midst of Israel and required to perform the less arduous work, and that in 1 Kings ix. 20 seq. and the passage before us on the other hand the Canaanitish tributary labourers are intended; but with this we could not reconcile 2 Chr. ii. 16, where it is expressly stated, that the labourers, the number of whom is given in 1 Kings v. 29 seq., were *foreigners in the land of the Israelites*, and therefore of Canaanitish origin. Still on comparing the different accounts still further, the conclusion to which we are brought is, that two different classes of labourers are distinguished. *First*, those who were bound to render tributary service, and who belonged to the Canaanitish tribes. They are called מס or מס-עבד, and are referred to in 1 Kings v. 13, 14, where "*from all Israel*" must mean *out of the whole of the land of Israel*, and not from the midst of the Israelites in contrast to the Canaanites, and also in 1 Kings ix. 20—23 and 2 Chr. viii. 7—10. There were thirty thousand of these, and 550 (according to the Chronicles 250) overseers were appointed to superintend them. Now, if we reckon fifty labourers to each overseer (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 17, 18) this would give us 27,500 labourers, a number which approaches very nearly to the 30,000 mentioned in Kings. *Secondly*, the Israelitish labourers, who were bearers of burdens and stone-cutters. They are noticed in 1 Kings v. 29—32 and 2 Chr. ii. 17, 18. These labourers are never called מס, and when we read in the Chronicles that they also were foreigners, whereas no such statement appears in 1 Kings v. 15—18, we are led to conclude that the two classes of labourers have not been kept distinct. The very general remark in 1 Kings ix. 22 and 2 Chr. viii. 9, where the great distinction between the Israelites and Canaanites is pointed out, and Solomon is said to have made none of the sons of Israel *servants*, refers to the fact, that no one was taken from the midst of the Israelites to perform tributary service, because Israel was

the ruling nation (the Israelites were *men of war, princes, chariot-soldiers,* &c.), but this did not prevent the employment of the Israelites as workmen, *e.g.*, bearers of burdens and stone-cutters.

V. 11. *The daughter of Pharaoh takes possession of the palace which Solomon built for her.* Compare 1 Kings ix. 24, where the event is but briefly referred to, though the notices in chap. iii. 1 and ix. 16 had already prepared the way. Hitherto the author of the Chronicles has not mentioned Pharaoh's daughter, nor have we any account of the conquest of the city of Gezer by Pharaoh, who gave it to his daughter as her dowry. And here he merely observes in a very cursory manner, when speaking of the buildings, that Solomon also built a house for Pharaoh's daughter, because he regarded it as improper that a woman should live in the house of David, "*for they are holy* (the plural must refer to the different rooms in David's house) *because the ark of Jehovah had come to them.*" According to 1 Kings iii. 1, Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter into the city of David, that is, no doubt, into the palace which was formerly inhabited by his father and after his death by himself, that she might dwell there till he had completed his other buildings and *his own house.* Hence the queen was afterwards to live in his own house, from which it follows, that "*the house which he had built for her*" formed part of Solomon's own house, a portion, that is, of his royal palace. The statement in 1 Kings iii. 1 requires the information in chap. ix. 24 to render it complete. We have then in the Book of Kings a full account of the entrance of the king's daughter into the house which Solomon had built for her.—The Pharaoh referred to here was *Psusennes*, the last king of the twenty-first dynasty (the Tanitic).—In 1 Kings ix. 24, the words "*Solomon built Millo then*" follow immediately upon the account of the house for Pharaoh's daughter; but they are omitted by our historian.

Vv. 12—16. *Solomon's sacrifices and the rest of the offerings are presented on the altar which he had built; the priests and Levites are appointed according to David's plan.* From the position of these words they answer to 1 Kings ix. 25, the obscure statements of that verse being partly explained, or rather paraphrased, and partly completed by the addition of farther particulars.—V. 12. The point of time indicated in the word "*then*" refers to the period immediately following the completion and consecration

of the temple, and the meaning is, as the next verse clearly shows, that from this time forth the sacrificial worship prescribed by Moses was regularly maintained and offered in the new temple. The emphasis is laid not upon the fact that Solomon offered burnt-sacrifices, but upon their being offered *on the altar which he had built.* In 1 Kings ix. 25 the meaning of the words (with the exception of the last three) is that the sacrifices, presented by Solomon on the three great festivals, were offered on the altar which he had built; the Chronicles in the following verse emphatically state that all the sacrifices were offered there.—V. 13. The ב in בדבר is difficult to understand; דְּבַר alone, as in Lev. xxiii. 37, would be more intelligible; but the *beth* is found in all the MSS. It must therefore be rendered: *they had to offer burnt-sacrifices with that which was appointed for every day, i.e.*, they had to offer the burnt-sacrifices appointed for every day. On the infinitive להעלות see for example 1 Chr. ix. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 2. *On the Sabbaths and on the new moons and on the feasts, three times a year;* the plural מועדים embraces under one term the three great feasts mentioned immediately afterwards (cf. *Hitzig* Ezek. xlvi. 10). The person sacrificing is not noticed, since reference is made to the sacrifices of the congregation, which were prescribed by the law, and the emphasis is again laid upon the fact that *from that time forth* they were offered upon the altar, which Solomon had built. V. 14. *He appointed* (carrying out David's arrangements) *the twenty-four divisions of priests* (1 Chr. xxiv.) *for their service, and he appointed the Levites to their charges to praise* (cf. 1 Chr. xxv. 3) *and to perform service before the priests* (1 Chr. xxiii. 28 sqq.) *according to the regulation for every day,* and he appointed *the door-keepers,* &c. (1 Chr. xxvi. 1—19). On the last words see Neh. xii. 24.—V. 15. The verb סור with the accusative of the object, meaning *to depart from the command,* does not occur any where else, we find סור מן in every other passage, and a few MSS. have this construction here. It does not seem to me improbable, that this was the construction originally intended here, and that the *mem* was dropped from mimmazoth for the sake of euphony. *With reference to all things* (especially) *with reference to the treasures,* (1 Chr. xxvi. 20—28); *i.e.* those

which had not been mentioned in the previous verse.—V. 16. *The whole of the work of Solomon was prepared, i.e.* was completed (cf. chap. xxix. 35, xxxv. 10, 16) *to this day;* what day is meant we learn from the context, according to which we can only think of the day, when the execution of David's plans brought the activity of David in connexion with the temple to a close. The מלאכת relates simply to the temple; this is clearly shown in the words which follow in apposition: the whole work, namely, from *the foundation of the temple and up to its completion. The house of Jehovah is completed;* with this postscript the author brings to a close the entire narrative from chap. i. 18 to this passage, the building of the temple is the principal subject, other things being only incidentally named. It must be borne in mind that these words correspond to the last three words of 1 Kings ix. 25; we remark too here in passing that we find no reference in the passage in Kings to any high-priestly functions exercised by Solomon.

Vv. 17, 18. *Voyage to Ophir* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 26—28). V. 17. Instead of הים we have in 1 Kings ים סוף *on the shore of the Red Sea in the land of Edom.*—V. 18. According to 1 Kings Hiram sent his servants in the fleet along with the servants of Solomon, but according to the account in this verse he sent "by the hands of his servants ships and servants, and they went to Ophir along with the servants of Solomon." We find it difficult to explain how an Israelitish man can have pictured Hiram sending ships from Tyre to Ezion-geber, since they can hardly have been conveyed by land across the isthmus of Suez, and the circumnavigation of Africa for that purpose is incredible, yet it is evident that this is the meaning of the historian's words, and that he saw no difficulty in the way of its accomplishment at the time when he wrote. (Keil says: "Tyrian ships could reach the Red Sea if they sailed round Africa. In favour of the supposition that they did so we might adduce the account, given by *Herodotus* [l. iv. 42] and defended by *Heeren* with most conclusive arguments [Ideen i. 2. p. 79 sqq. 4th ed.], that Necho sent out Phœnician sailors who circumnavigated Africa. It is true Herodotus says that he knows Necho to have been the first to prove that Africa is entirely surrounded by water with the exception of the small isthmus that connects it with Asia, and thus

seems to imply, that previously this had not been known ; but he also says that Necho instructed the Phœnician sailors to start from the Arabian Sea, and return to Egypt by coming through the Pillars of Hercules into the Northern [Mediterranean] Sea, and from this the contrary might be inferred, so that we cannot argue with any certainty from this account of Herodotus that the Phœnicians had not sailed round Africa before. We admit that there are no historical records of such voyages, but the Phœnicians, from commercial considerations, purposely threw a veil of secrecy over their more distant expeditions [vid *Heeren* ut. sup. p. 27 sqq., 55.] Huët[1] and Michaelis [spicil. i. p. 99 sqq.], though for different reasons, have both assumed the circumnavigation of Africa in the time of Solomon. But if the Phœnicians had really already undertaken this voyage, they would certainly have made it frequently, and in that case it could hardly have remained a secret. If, however, any should assume, that it was only occasionally, or under Solomon, that they sent a fleet round Africa into the Arabian Sea, to trade in this gulf, they could have attained their object much more easily by conveying their vessels into the Red Sea over the isthmus of Suez. In ancient times it was so well-known and frequent a plan to transport ships and even whole fleets across isthmuses and tracts of country, in order to take them from one sea to another, that there is no difficulty in such a supposition. Thus *Herodotus* relates [vii. 24], that Xerxes had the isthmus of Mount Athos cut through, merely to show his power and leave a memorial of it behind him, as he could have conveyed the ships over the isthmus without any great difficulty. *Wesseling* also adduces a statement from *Polyan* [strateg. v. 26] to the effect that Dionysius of Sicily made his soldiers carry eighty triremes a distance of half-a-mile in one day. According to *Thucydides* [iv. 8] the Peloponnesians conveyed eighty ships across the Leucadian isthmus. *Arrian* says that Alexander had ships transported from the Indus into the Hydaspes, and from Phœnicia into the Euphrates [Book v. and vii.]. Cleopatra wanted to have her whole fleet conveyed from the Mediterranean Sea to the Arabian Gulf; and was only pre-

[1] Comment. sur les navigations de Salomon, in his "traités" geographiques et historiques, t. ii. à la Haye 1730.

vented by the Arabians, who burnt the ships that were first drawn on land [see *Plutarch* vit. Ant.]. Further examples are mentioned by Diodorus Siculus iv. 56, Ammian. Marcellus xxiv. 7, and Huët, p. 40 sqq. It was evidently in this manner that the Tyrians under Hiram conveyed their ships into the Arabian Gulf, that they might sail with Solomon's vessels to Ophir and take part in the trade of that place, as we find narrated in 1 Kings ix. 26 seq., and x. 11, and also in 2 Chr. viii. 18, and ix. 10. On the situation of *Ophir* see *Lassen* indische Alterthumskunde i. p. 537 sqq., [Lassen connects the name with the people of the Abhira, who dwelt at the mouth of the Indus] and *C. Ritter* die Erdkunde Thl. 14. p. 351—431 [his thorough investigation also leads to the conclusion that Ophir was in India]. It is well known that others suppose it to have been situated in Jemen or Sofala; *Knobel* [Völkertafel p. 190—193] also looks for it in the southwest of Arabia; the arguments adduced in favour of this site have been subjected by *Ritter* to a careful examination; those in favour of India are of much greater weight").—*Four hundred and fifty talents of gold*; it cannot be determined whether they are to be regarded as the product of one voyage or of the whole trade with Ophir; from chap. ix. 13, however, it is more probable that the whole of the gold imported from Ophir is intended here. See chap. ix. 10 and xi. 21.

Chap. ix. 1—12. *Visit of the Queen of Sabaea*; (cf. 1 Kings x. 1—13; and see the commentary on that passage.—Tr.)

Vv. 13—28. *Solomon's wealth, his forces, and the extension of his kingdom*; answering to 1 Kings x. 14—29, see the commentary on that passage.—Tr.

Vv. 29—31. *Close of Solomon's history*; v. 30 seq. agreeing almost word for word with 1 Kings xi. 42 seq.

III. Chap. x.—Chap. xxxvi.

History of the kings who reigned in Jerusalem, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah.

The account of the revolt of the northern tribes, which was

followed by the division of the kingdom of David and Solomon into two separate Israelitish kingdoms (chap. x.—xi. 4), forms an introduction to the history of the monarchical government in the southern kingdom and of the descendants of David who reigned in Jerusalem. But as that account contains at the same time a portion of the history of Rehoboam's reign, and we intend for the sake of clearness to give each reign a chapter to itself, we shall connect it with the general history of Rehoboam.

1. CHAP. X.—XII.

RISE OF THE SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN KINGDOMS. HISTORY OF REHOBOAM.

Chap. x. *Revolt of the northern tribes*; cf. 1 Kings xii. 1—19: see the commentary on that passage.

Chap. xi. 1—4. *In obedience to the word of God by the prophet Shemaiah, Rehoboam and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin desist from their intended attack upon the northern tribes:* see the commentary on 1 Kings xii. 21—24.

V. 5—12. *The means adopted by Rehoboam for the defence of his kingdom.* The brief history of Rehoboam in the Book of Kings contains no notice of this.—V. 5. *And he built cities for defence in Judah:* the singular לְמָצוֹר is used, because the cities were to serve for the defence of the southern kingdom; *Judah* is used here as the name of the southern kingdom, because the fortresses mentioned in the following verses were situated in the provinces of Judah and Benjamin.—V. 6—10. We may assume that of the fifteen cities named here, *Aijalon* (in Dan Josh. xix. 42) and *Zorah* (first in Judah Josh. xv. 33, then in Dan Josh. xix. 41), though they formerly belonged to Dan, were at this time reckoned as belonging to the province of Benjamin, which had extended over districts, that were at first assigned to Dan, that tribe having conquered for itself a new inheritance in the most northerly part of the land (Judg. xvii. seq.). *Aijalon*, now Yalo (*Robinson* iii. p. 278), and *Zorah* (probably the present Surah half way between Jerusalem and Jabneh, *Robinson* ii. p.

592) are at least the only cities named here, which from their situation could have belonged to the province of Benjamin, and according to v. 10 the cities, referred to, included fortresses in Benjamin. *Gath;* the city of the Philistines, which had been conquered by David (1 Chr. xviii. 1). It is true that in 1 Kings ii. 39 we read of a king Achish of Gath in the time of Solomon, but it is evident from 2 Chr. ix. 26 and 1 Kings v. 1 that this city was subject to Solomon, even though it had maintained a certain independence under a king of its own. It cannot, therefore, appear strange to us to find the name of this city of the Philistines among the cites fortified by Rehoboam. *Adoraim*, afterwards called Dora, now Dura, a village on the south west of Hebron (Robinson iii. p. 209). ערי מצורות, the second accusative to ויבן in v. 6 (cf. chap. viii. 5), *he built Beth-lehem, &c., as fortresses.* The fifteen cities were on the south and west of Jerusalem, hence Rehoboam appears to have been more afraid of an attack from the south and west, that is from the Egyptians, than of a war with the northern kingdom.—V. 11. *And he made the fortresses strong;* in this connection the meaning of these words must be that he prepared them for defence in case of an attack, by appointing commanders (cf. v. 23), stocking them with provisions, and (v. 12) supplying them with military stores; for all these defensive measures are summed up again in the expression "*he made them exceeding strong.*" By the supplementary clause "*and he had Judah and Benjamin,*" the statement in chap. x. 17, "he was king over the Israelites who dwelt in the cities of Judah," is more precisely defined.

V. 13—17. *The southern kingdom is strengthened by the fac that the priests and Levites, who are expelled from the northern kingdom, take refuge in it and are followed thither by faithful worshippers of Jehovah from all the tribes.* In the Book of Kings reference is made in 1 Kings xii. 31 and xiii. 33, 34, to the circumstances described here, but the facts narrated in these verses are not recorded there.—V. 14. *For the Levites left their suburbs* (Num. xxxv. 1—8) *and their possessions;* according to v. 8 of the passage cited we are to understand by their possessions the cities of the Levites in the districts of the northern tribes, *for Jeroboam and his sons had thrust them out of the priesthood of Jehovah;* Jeroboam had prohibited his subjects from visiting the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kings xii. 26—28), and had appointed

his own places of worship in Bethel and Dan, where Jehovah was worshipped in the form of an ox, and thus the priests and Levites, who would not break away from the temple at Jerusalem, were compelled by him to leave the kingdom. *And his sons;* by this we are certainly not to understand that the sons of Jeroboam were associated with him in the administration of the government; nor are we even to interpret the words as denoting his lineal descendants, since his second son Nadab was the last of his house who reigned over the northern kingdom; we conclude, therefore, that the persons intended are the successors of Jeroboam in general, and that the passage merely indicates the relation in which all the kings of the northern kingdom stood to the priests of the tribe of Levi and to the rest of the Levites.—V. 15. "*For the high places;*" cf. 1 Kings xii. 31, "a house of high places;" similar places of worship were certainly established in other cities of the northern kingdom (cf. 2 Kings xvii. 9, ix. 29 sqq.). *For the goats,* or for the demons; according to Lev. xvii. 7 this was an odious term applied to idolatry generally (like גִּלּוּלִים in 1 Kings xii. 15), which, if not actually introduced by Jeroboam, may have been in existence in his time, and may subsequently have spread further and further. In this verse, as well as the preceding, reference is made to the state of the northern kingdom in Jeroboam's time. *For the calves;* see 1 Kings xii. 28, according to which the words "which he had made" are to be referred to the calves alone.—V. 16. *Such as set their hearts;* cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 19. *They came to Jerusalem,* not only *to offer sacrifices* there, but, as we learn from the next verse, to remain in the southern kingdom. In the same way, at a later period, we find subjects of the northern kingdom connecting themselves with the southern, chap. xv. 9, xxx. 11. *For three years;* there is no reason to question the antiquity of this record, but on the contrary it is *a priori* probable, that the pressure from the north occasioned a proportionally greater earnestness in the religious life of the south, and that the former was weakened and the latter strengthened by the immigrations from the north to the south.

V. 18—23. *Family-records.* In the brief account of the life of Rehoboam we do not meet with these notices, which were probably taken from the sources named in chap. xii. 15.—V. 18. Instead of *ben* many of the MSS., the Septuagint, and the

Vulgate adopt the reading *bath* (daughter) from the Keri; in the Syriac the family-records contained in these verses are not given. *Jerimoth* is not mentioned among the sons of David in 1 Chr. iii. 1—8; if our text be correct he must be regarded as a son of one of David's concubines (1 Chr. iii. 9). Before *Abichail* the Septuagint translators read the *vav copul.*; if we insert this in the text the words may be rendered as follows: *Mahalath the daughter of Jerimoth the son of David, and of Abichail the daughter of Eliab the son of Jesse.* In this case there would be only *one* wife of Rehoboam referred to in the verse before us, namely Mahalath, whose father and mother are both given, and this would fully agree with v. 19 (cf. *v.* 20, "*after her*), where we have further details of only one wife. *Eliab*; the first born of Jesse, 1 Chr. ii. 13.—V. 19. The three sons of Rehoboam here named are only mentioned in this passage. V. 20. *Maacah*; this is the name which we also meet with in 1 Kings xv. 2, but in 2 Chr. xiii. 2 *Michaiah* is said to have been the mother of Abijah; the latter name, however, has crept into the text through a copyist's error. *The daughter of Absalom*; *i.e.*, *of* David's son, for this is the only Absalom we can think of, as there is no further description connected with the name. *Daughter* must be interpreted as meaning *granddaughter*, as we may see from 2 Sam. xiv. 27. Maacah, then, is to be regarded as a daughter of Tamar, as *Josephus* says (Antiq. 8. 10. 1), cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 18. *Abijah*; in 1 Kings he is always called *Abijam*; the former of the two is no doubt correct. The other three children of Maacah are only mentioned here.—V. 21. *He took*; chap. xiii. 21. Instead of *sixty concubines* Josephus mentions only thirty.—V. 22. *He appointed him as chief*, gave him the pre-eminence among his brethren, or, as it is afterwards said by way of explanation, appointed him *as prince among his brethren* (not עַל אָחִיו 1 Sam. x. 1, xiii. 14). The short infinitive לְהַמְלִיכוֹ must be interpreted thus: *for* (his intention in doing this was) *to make him king*.—V. 23. *And he* (Rehoboam) *acted sagaciously and dispersed* (פָּרַץ *to scatter*, to locate in different places) *of all his sons* (the different individuals) *into all the provinces of Judah and Benjamin, into all the fortresses, and gave them provisions in abundance, and desired for them a multitude of wives.* Are we to understand that the sagacity of Reho-

boam was displayed in the fact that he entrusted the most important cities of the land, the fortified places, to the care of his sons, and thus put them into the hands of safe commanders? Or did he act wisely in securing for his sons an independent position, an ample revenue and many wives, in other words, a splendid court, and thus making them contented, and saving the brother, for whom the crown was intended, from the fear of rival claims? On comparing chap. xxi. 2, 3, we are necessarily brought to the latter conclusion. *The multitude of wives*, therefore, is mentioned in connexion with the provisions in abundance as an evidence of the splendour of their mode of living and the glory of their respective courts. It is not at all necessary to assume in explanation of this passage, that Rehoboam gave his sons many wives, who were taken from the cities, which he had assigned to them as their places of abode, in order that he might thus establish a closer connexion between his sons and the inhabitants of the cities.

Chap. xii. 1—12. *The Egyptian king Shishak conquers Jerusalem;* (compare the brief account in 1 Kings xiv. 25—28.)—V. 1. The infinitive כְּהַכִּין, "*at the time of the strengthening*," must be regarded as an indefinite active, and resolved as follows: when they had strengthened, or, as we should express it, "*when the kingdom of Rehoboam had become strong;*" the reference is to chap xi. 17.—"*And when he had become strong;*" see chap. xxvi. 16.—*All Israel;* all the inhabitants of the southern kingdom (cf. v. 6). The meaning is, that for the first three years of his reign Rehoboam and his people adhered faithfully to God; in the fourth year the apostasy occurred; in the fifth the punishment of the apostasy was inflicted (v. 2.)—V. 2 we find in precisely the same terms in 1 Kings xiv. 25, with the exception of the explanatory clause at the end. On *Shishak*, the first king of the twenty-second (Bubast.) dynasty of Manetho, compare *Thenius* on 1 Kings xi. 40. On a piece of sculpture in the great palace at Carnac *Champollion* found Shishak represented as the conqueror of a large number of princes, among whom, if the inscription was read correctly, the name Rehoboam was found. —V. 3. Among the numberless troops, brought by Shishak from Egypt, there were *Libyans* (chap. xvi. 8, Daniel xi. 43; in Gen

x. 13 they are called *Lehabim*, probably the inhabitants of Mareotis and Libya, to the west of the Canopian mouth of the Nile, *Knobel* Völkertafel p. 283), *Sukkiim* (only mentioned in this passage, according to the Septuagint and Vulgate, they were Troglodites, probably the Ethiopian Troglodytes on the mountains along the western coast of the Arabian gulf, cf. *Winer* Reallexicon *s.v.* Suchim), *and Ethiopians* (from the districts to the south of Egypt).—V. 4. *The fortresses;* viz. those which had been put in a state of defence for the purpose of resisting an invasion on the part of the Egyptians.—V. 5. Whilst Shishak with his army stood before Jerusalem, Shemaiah spoke to Rehoboam and the princes, who had been driven back by the Egyptian army and had retired to Jerusalem for the purpose of defending the capital. *Ye have forsaken;* see 1 Chr. xiii. 11. By the concluding words, "*therefore have I left you*" &c., the prophet sets before them utter defeat and complete destruction, as we may infer from *v.* 7 and *v.* 12 ("*I will not destroy them*"); see also the similar words in chap. xv. 2, xxiv. 20, and Deut. xxxi. 16 seq. *Into the power of Shishak;* Neh. ix. 28.—V. 6. *Then they bowed themselves;* chap. vii. 14, xiii. 18, xxxii. 26. *The princes of Israel;* in v. 5 we find "the princes of Judah." *Jehovah is just;* Ezra ix. 15; Neh. ix. 33.—V. 7. כמעט *in a little, i.e,* in a short time; compare the similar words in Ezra ix. 8. *And my wrath shall not be poured out upon Jerusalem by Shishak;* see on the other hand chap. xxxiv. 25.—V. 8. *For they shall be servants to him* for a short time, *that they may discern my service and the service of the kingdoms of the lands, i.e.,* that they may see that my rule is not so oppressive as that of foreign kings. "*Of the kingdoms of the countries;*" cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 30.—V. 9. The account of Shishak's invasion is renewed after this parenthesis, and the words of v. 2 are repeated. It was not necessary to say expressly that the invasion did not end with a mere advance against Jerusalem, as the temple and palace could not possibly be plundered till the city was conquered.—*The golden shields;* cf. chap. ix. 16. There is a clause appended to the Septuagint version of 1 Kings xiv. 26 to the effect that Shishak also carried away the golden armour, which David had taken as spoil in the war with the king of Zobah, cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 7.—V. 11. *The runners,* who kept guard

in the porch of the king's palace (2 Kings xi. 19) attended the king when he went to the temple, and then carried away the valuable shields. It is probable that these shields were used on other occasions in connection with solemn processions, in which the king took part. They were kept *in the guard-room of the runners;* the golden shields which Solomon had made were kept in the forest-house of Lebanon (chap. ix. 16).—V. 12. Account of the fulfilment of the promise contained in v. 7 seq. "*And* (it was) *not entirely to destroy* (the infinitive after the negative as in 1 Chr. v. 1) *the good things, which still remained in Judah;* these were piety and faithful adherence to Jehovah, for the sake of which Judah was not altogether destroyed, cf. chap. xix. 3.

Vv. 13, 14. *Length of Rehoboam's reign. His mother. Estimate of his character* (cf. 1 Kings xiv. 21, 22). V. 12. On the first clause see chap. i. 1, xiii. 21. As Rehoboam's reign has been described already, we must explain the verse as follows: *King Rehoboam* (after the withdrawal of the Egyptians) strengthened *his government* (he was not strong enough to resist Jeroboam, chap. xiii. 7) *and was king, for he was forty-one years old when he began to reign, and he reigned seventeen years;* the word *for* is used here, because it is evident from the chronological data, that he reigned for a series of years after the conquest of Jerusalem by Shishak, which took place in the fifth year of his reign. שְׁתֵּי, in 1 Kings שְׁתַּיִם; in many MSS. the word is pointed thus in this passage also. The composite Sheva is sometimes introduced in this manner after י, to make it still more evident that the Sheva does not close the syllable. *Which Jehovah had chosen;* cf. chap. vi. 5, 6, and 20. *Naamah the Ammonitess,* see chap. x. 1.—V. 14. In the Book of Kings the judgment here pronounced is extended to the conduct of Judah, that is, of the inhabitants of the southern kingdom; here it is restricted to that of the king. On the conduct of the people the historian had already had occasion to speak at chap. xi. 17, xii. 12, he had also given such an account of Rehoboam in the chapter under revision, vv. 6 and 12, that the general announcement "*he did evil*" would appear somewhat strange if it were not modified and rendered more definite by the further clause "*for he did not direct his heart firmly to seek Jehovah*" (chap. xix. 3, xxx. 19; Ezra vii. 10).

Vv. 15, 16. *Conclusion*; cf. 1 Kings xiv. 29, 30.—V. 15. *And the wars of Rehoboam and Jeroboam were every day, i.e.*, they continued during the whole of Rehoboam's reign; cf. chap. xi. 4.—V. 16. *Abijah*, see chap. xi. 22.

2. CHAP. XIII.

ABIJAH.

Vv. 1 and 2 a. (cf. 1 Kings xv. 1, 2) *Michaiah daughter of Uriel of Gibeah*; in chap. xi. 20—22 and 1 Kings xv. 2, 10, 13, his mother is called Maacah the daughter of Absalom. *Caspari* (on Micha the Morasthite) concludes that she had two names; that the one, Maacah, was given her by her mother at her birth, and that she received the other as a mark of her husband's favour when she became queen-mother. But nothing of this kind is said at chap. xi. 20 seq., where there was a fitting opportunity for speaking of any such change of name, and although, as *Caspari* says, we find the name Michaiah in the passage before us in which she is first mentioned as queen-mother, yet in the parallel passage of the Book of Kings the name Maacah occurs just as on every other occasion. In the *Septuagint* and *Syriac* the name Maacah is given here also, and if the *Vulgate* has Michaia all that can be inferred from this is, that at a comparatively early time the name Michaia had been substituted for *Maacah* through an error of the pen. It is further to be observed that the mother of Abijah is always described as a daughter of Absalom, and that this is the only passage in which she is said to have been a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. The two accounts might be reconciled by assuming that the daughter of Absalom was married to Uriel, and that Maacah the mother of Abijah was their daughter, and might therefore be called a daughter of Absalom, whose grand-daughter she actually was. When, however, we consider that the wife of Abijah and mother of Asa was also named Maacah (1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Ch. xv. 16), and further that in 1 Kings xv. 10 this Maacah is also said to have been the daughter of Absalom, whilst there are no such statements in the Chronicles, there is no improbability in the conjecture that

Maacah, the mother of Abijah, the daughter of Absalom, has been confused with Maacah the mother of Asa, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, and that in the passage before us the mother of Asa has been substituted by mistake for the mother of Abijah.[1] It is possible that the Uriel mentioned here may have been the Levite spoken of in the history of David (1 Chr. xv. 5, 11), but this is improbable on chronological grounds. Whether the Gibeah here named was the well-known city in the tribe of Benjamin (Gibeath Benjamin or Gibeath Saul) or Gibeah in the province of Judah (Josh. xv. 57, most likely the village of Jeba on a conical hill to the southwest of Bethlehem, *Robinson* ii. 580, 593) cannot be determined.

V. 2 b.—20. *War between Abijah and Jeroboam.* The Book of Kings contains no account of this war, which is merely referred to in the few words "*there was strife between Abijah and Jeroboam*" (1 Kings xv. 6, 7).—V. 3. *And Abijah opened the war*, 1 Kings xx. 14.—*With an army, heroes of war, four hundred thousand young men*; בחיל occurs in just this connection in chap. xiv. 8, the number being placed afterwards in apposition. גבור חיל, chap. xvii. 16 seq. in the same sense as גבורי מלחמה.—V. 4. Abijah encamped *on* Mount Zemaraim; when he stood up to speak he rose up *from upon* (מֵעַל) the hill. The prep. *al* is associated with the *lamed* of indirect subordination, though in a somewhat less dependent position. Mount *Zemaraim* is only met with here; the city of that name, which is mentioned in Josh xviii. 22 as situated near Bethel, and was therefore probably a little to the south of this city on the northern frontier of the kingdom of Abijah, was most likely a fortified city built upon the mountain referred to here. The opinion that Zemaraim was connected with *Cherbet el Somra* in the valley of the Jordan (*v. Raumer* p. 204) is scarcely favoured by this passage. As Abijah now spoke from Mount Zemaraim, so did Jotham the

[1] It is difficult to see why the word "mother" may not stand for grandmother in 1 Ki. xv. 10 as well as the word "daughter" for grand-daughter in this passage, which Bertheau admits may be a sufficient explanation. The same Maacah would then be intended throughout, who would be daughter of Uriel, daughter (= grand-daughter) of Absalom, mother of Abijah, and mother (= grand-mother) of Asa. So *Keil.—Tr.*

son of Gideon formerly speak from Mount Gerizim to the inhabitants of Sichem, Judg. ix. 7.—V. 5. *Is it not to you to know, i.e.* must it not be known to you? The infinitive with *lamed* in this connexion is one of the peculiarities of our historian (cf. 1 Chr. xiii. 4). *A covenant of salt;* these words are added (in the accusative) to give greater precision to the entire sentence: *as a salt covenant*, or *after the manner of a salt covenant* (Num. xviii. 9). In Lev. ii. 13, we find a reference to the salt of the covenant, which had to be sprinkled upon all the meat-offerings (offerings of corn; according to Ezek. xliii. 24 it was sprinkled upon the animal sacrifices also), so that every offering was made, as it were, a covenant-offering by means of the salt. This was certainly in accordance with an ancient custom, according to which the salt durst not be omitted from the covenant-feasts, the salt itself being regarded as a symbol of the perpetuity and indestructibility of the covenant; hence the salt-covenant was a firm covenant, which had been concluded in a peculiarly solemn manner.—V. 6. *The servant of Solomon*; 1 Kings xi. 11.—V. 7. The first clause calls to mind 1 Kings xi. 24. "*Children of Belial;*" this expression does not occur anywhere else in the Chronicles; see 1 Kings xxi. 10—13.—Rehoboam was forty-one years old when he began to reign (chap. xii. 13) and therefore when we find him referred to here as a boy (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 1) and of tender heart, *i.e.*, modest and retiring, this must evidently be intended to make the conduct of Jeroboam appear the more hateful when contrasted with the circumstances of the youthful king. It must also be borne in mind, that in 2 Chr. x. 8 Rehoboam is described as manifesting all the rashness of youth. *And did not show himself firm;* cf. chap. xii. 13.—V. 8. *And now ye speak* (think) *to show yourselves strong before the kingdom of Jehovah through the hand of the sons of David* (ye expect to contend successfully against the kingdom, which Jehovah himself is governing through the descendants of David; and indeed) *ye are a great multitude, and with you are the golden calves* (chap. xi. 15), but that can do you no good, for Jehovah is on our side, not on yours (v. 10), for ye have offended Him as ye yourselves must admit.—V. 9. *Have ye not banished the priests of Jehovah, &c.* (chap. xi. 14), *and made you priests like the nations of the lands*, whose priests are not sons of Levi (1 Kings

xii. 31, and particularly xiii. 33), making a priest, for example, of *every one who came for consecration* (למלא ידו that they might fill his hand, Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9, *i.e.* that he might receive authority to perform the duties of the priest's office, cf. Judg. xvii. 5) with a *young bullock and seven rams?* According to Ex. xxix., when a priest was consecrated, a young bullock was sacrificed as an expiatory offering, a ram as a burnt-offering, and another as a ram of consecration. This had to be done for seven days, and hence seven rams were required. It is evident, therefore, that the sacrifices prescribed by the law are referred to in this passage, though they are not fully described. But these sacrifices alone were not sufficient to constitute any one a priest of Jehovah, and hence Jeroboam's priests were merely priests of an imaginary deity (lit. a *non-Elohim*), *i.e.*, as Jehovah was really Elohim, priests who could make no pretension to be priests of Jehovah. —V. 10. *And the Levites are in the service; i.e.*, they perform the service in accordance with the law, for it can be duly performed by members of the tribe of Levi alone.—V. 11. Thus we are in possession of the worship prescribed by the law. The words from קטרת-סמים onwards are very loosely connected: *and the sweet smelling incense and the showbread, &c.* (exist among us). Only *one* gilded table is mentioned here; cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 16, 2 Chr. iv. 19.—*The charge of Jehovah*; Lev. viii. 35.—V. 12. *And behold, with us there are at the head* (as champions and leaders, not the two calves (v. 8) but) *the God* (Jehovah) *and his priests*, (and beside this we have also) *the sounding trumpets, that they may sound against you*, (but their sounding is the sure pledge of victory on our side, Num. x. 9 and xxxi. 6, therefore) *ye Israelites*, (as distinguished from the men of Judah, v. 14 sqq.) *fight not against Jehovah, for ye will not succeed*, cf. chap. xxiv. 20.— Vv. 13—17. Abijah fought under the most unfavourable circumstances, being attacked both before and behind, but yet he obtained the most complete victory, for his warriors cried to Jehovah, and the priests blew their trumpets.—V. 13. *Jeroboam caused the troops appointed for an ambush to come round to their rear; and the rest of their troops* (evidently led by Jeroboam himself) *formed in front of Judah, and those who formed the ambush in their rear.*—V. 14. As soon as he was attacked, *Judah prepared* to meet the enemy, and then first was it discovered that the

attack had been made on two sides.—V. 15. וירעו; in the connection in which this word occurs here it can hardly denote the shout of the warriors. The reference to v. 12 is very conspicuous, and we must therefore render the passage: *the men of Judah had* (the war trumpets) *sounded*, which were blown by the priests at their head, and in consequence of this "*Jehovah himself smote Israel*" (cf. chap. xiv. 11; Judg. xx. 35).—V. 17. *And Abijah and his people slew among them a great slaughter;* Num. xi. 33; Josh. x. 20.—Vv. 18—20. Consequences of Abijah's victory.—V. 18. ויכנאו is an antithesis to "*the sons of Judah became strong,*" and therefore means "*they were humbled, became weak*" (differently expressed in chap. xii. 6).—V. 19. The city of Jeshanah (*Septuagint* Ἰεσανά) only occurs in this passage, it is probably the same as Ἰσάνας, *Josephus* Antiq. 14. 15. 12; we are unable to discover the exact site on which it stood. *Ephron* (Kethib, Septuagint and Vulgate) we should necessarily connect with Mount Ephron on the south-western border of the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xv. 9): but the Keri has *Ephrain*, and this spelling rather points to Ἐφραίμ (Josh. xi. 54), a city which was situated, according to Josephus (B. j. 4. 9. 9), in the neighbourhood of Bethel. The three cities named here with their surrounding districts did not continue long in the possession of the king of the southern kingdom. They are apparently noticed again in chap. xv. 8 as the cities which Asa had taken from Mount Ephraim; but Baasha, the king of the northern kingdom, had reconquered the territory in which these three cities stood, as we may infer from the fact that he made an attempt to fortify Ramah, which was only about five miles distant from Jerusalem (1 Kings xv. 17).—V. 20. "*Recover strength;*" see 1 Chr. xxix. 14. *And Jehovah smote him* (Jeroboam) *and he died;* do these words refer to a sudden death, or some peculiarly painful disease (cf. chap. xxi. 18); or does the word וינגפהו recal the great event recorded in v. 15, "*and God smote Jeroboam?*" The latter is the more natural conclusion. Jeroboam did not die for two years after the death of Abijah.

V. 21. chap. xiv. 1. *Abijah's wives and children. His death.* —V. 21. cf. chap. xii. 13. It was not in consequence of his becoming strong on his throne that he took the wives, for he only reigned three years, and must therefore most likely have

had the greater number of his wives before he became king; by the *vav. conseq.* in וישא the account of the wives and children is only connected quite loosely with the previous words.—Chap. xiv. 1 (cf. chap. xii. 16). *During Asa's reign the land had rest ten years,* a remark which is no doubt made here because this rest was the result of the great victory of Abijah over Jeroboam; the period of rest was spent by Asa (according to chap. xiv. 5) in building fortresses in Judah (cf. chap. xv. 19).

3. CHAP. XIV.—CHAP. XVI.

ASA.

Chap. xiv. 2—5 (1—4). *Asa, a pious king, removes the foreign altars and endeavours to root out idolatry.* In the history of Asa in the first Book of Kings (chap. xv.) the 11th and 12th verses correspond to these four verses, except that very different expressions are employed to describe the idols, which Asa removed.—V. 1 (2). Compare the sentence on King Hezekiah, chap. xxxi. 20. —Vv. 2 (3). *He removed . . . the high places;* in chap. xv. 17, and 1 Kings xv. 14, on the other hand, it is said that *the high places were not taken away.* In the same way do we find it said of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii. 6) that he removed high places, whereas in chap. xx. 33, a complaint is uttered that in his days the high places were not taken away. These apparently contradictory statements must refer to two different kinds of high places, as we may gather from the context. The high places which had been set apart for idolatrous worship they removed, but those which were consecrated to the worship of Jehovah, *e.g.* the Bamah in Bethel, where Jehovah was worshipped under the image of an ox, were still left standing. *Asherim;* compare *Thenius* on 1 Kings xiv. 23, who has shown, as I think correctly, that Ashera primarily denoted any image set up for the purpose of idolatrous worship, and was afterwards applied more particularly to the image of Astarte. V. 3 (4). cf. chap. xv. 12. V. 4 (5). חמנים; the images or the pillars, which are described in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 4, as standing upon the altar of Baal. *And the kingdom was quiet before him;* this does not mean that there

were no wars at all during his reign, but that the southern kingdom had peace when he was king, though it may have been but for a short time (cf. chap. xiii. 23).

Vv. 5—7 (6—8). *Military defences;* in 1 Kings xv. 23 there is also a reference to fortresses, which were built by Asa. —V. 5. (6). *He built fortresses;* chap. xi. 5 sqq. *During these years;* the ten years of rest mentioned in chap. xiii. 23. It is evident from the connection and the course of the narrative that the first ten years of his reign are intended.—V. 6 (7). *Those cities there;* what cities we are not told, but the historian was evidently thinking of other cities besides Gebah and Mispah, which are described in chap. xvi. 6 as having been fortified by Asa. *We will build a wall round about;* the verb נסב conveys the general notion of building and making ready with reference to the following objects, *towers, doors, and bolts. The land is still before us;* we can move freely in it, and build fortresses at pleasure, whereas at a future time, if the foe should invade the country and keep possession, we should be prevented from doing this.—*So they built and succeeded;* correctly rendered by the *Vulgate, nullumque in exstruendo impedimentum fuit.*—V. 7. The sons of Judah also came to David with *shield and lance,* that is as heavy armed (1 Chr. xii. 24), whilst Benjamin furnished archers, cf. 1 Chr. viii. 40. Judah and Benjamin contributed 580,000 men; according to chap. xiii. 3 Abijah led 400,000 men into the field.

Vv. 8—14 (9—15). *The Cushite Zerach invades Judah with a large army and is defeated.*—V. 8 (9). We are certainly warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Cushite *Zerach* was the same person as Osorkhon, who followed Shishak (Sesonchis) in the line of Egyptian kings, and was the second king of the twenty-second dynasty. On the royal arms of Egypt he is called *Osorkhon,* a name which reminds us at once of Zerach. On the reason for his being called the Cushite, and not the king of Egypt, see *Thenius* on 1 Kings xv. 23. *Mareshah;* one of the cities which Rehoboam fortified (chap. xi. 8).—V. 10. The battle was fought in the valley of Zephathah which extends to Mareshah. The valley of Zephathah must not be confounded with Zephath mentioned in Judg. i. 17, since the account contained in these verses clearly shows that it was situ-

ated somewhere in the neighbourhood of Mareshah, and according to Robinson, ii. 693, the latter city was about a Roman mile and a-half to the south of Eleutheropolis. Mareshah was in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv. 44). We must not imagine that this extensive south-western plain was called *the valley of Zephathah*, for in other places it is called הַשְּׁפֵלָה; on the contrary we may conclude that the scene of the battle was a valley, which opens into this plain, probably the fine open valley of which Robinson speaks (ii. 613).—V. 10 (11). *There is none beside thee to help between the mighty and the powerless; i.e.* no other than thou can help in an unequal conflict, meaning of course give help to the weaker side. בין before the first word, לְ (for which in other instances we find וּבֵין *e.g.* Gen. i. 13) before the second, as in Gen. i. 6 *between water and between water.* The *Vulgate* renders the passage thus: *Domine, non est apud te ulla distantia utrum in paucis auxilieris an in pluribus;* in this the translators were guided by 1 Sam. xiv. 6. The earlier expositors *(e.g. Rambach)* adopt this rendering, and supply מעצור before עָצוּר from the passage referred to; cf. 1 Macc. iii. 18. *In thy name we have fallen upon this multitude;* a similar passage occurs in chap. xx. 12 cf. 1 Kings xx. 13, 28.—V. 11 (12). *So Jehovah smote,* &c.; cf. chap. xiii. 15.—V. 12 (13). *As far as to Gerar; Rowland* found in the Wady Gerar, about eight miles to the south-east of Gaza, Kirbet-el-Gerar, which stands no doubt on the site of the ancient Gerar. לְאֵין לָהֶם מִחְיָה, *till they had nothing alive;* cf. Ezra ix. 8, 9, 14. For לְאֵין we find the clearer expression עַד-לְאֵין 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16. *Before his camp;* the army of Asa is called a camp of Jehovah, because God himself conducted it to victory. Earlier expositors fancied that the reference was to a heavenly camp, a host of angels, according to Gen. xxxii. 2 seq.—V. 13 (14). The cities round about Gerar were probably at that time in the possession of the Philistines, who had very likely joined with the Cushite Zerach in attacking Asa. *For the dread of Jehovah had fallen upon them;* viz. upon the inhabitants of the cities (chap. xvii. 10, 20, 29). בַּזָּה רַבָּה *much spoil* (chap. xxv. 13); the word *bizzah* occurs once in Ezekiel (xxix. 19), otherwise we only meet with it in the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and Esther.—V. 14 (15). *And they also smote the tents of the cattle;* probably they

conquered the nomad tribes in the neighbourhood of Gerar and in the desert to the south of Gerar, and took their camels and sheep as prey.

Chap. xv. 1—15. *Asa follows the injunctions of the prophet Azariah ben Oded to root out idolatry, and serve Jehovah alone. In a solemn assembly in the third month of the fifteenth year of Asa's reign all Judah and Benjamin, and strangers from other Israelitish tribes, pledged themselves to adhere faithfully to Jehovah.*—V. 1. On *Azariah ben Oded* see v. 8.—V. 2. The prophet *went to meet* Asa, as he was returning from the war; ויצא לפני occurs with the same signification in chap. xxviii. 9; (cf. 1 Chr. xiv. 8). On the last clause of the verse see chap. xxiv. 20.—Vv. 3—5. Earlier commentators disputed whether these verses referred to past times, or to the condition of the northern kingdom when the words were spoken, or to a future period (namely, during the exile of the Israelites), and whether the term Israel was applied to the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, to those of the southern kingdom, or to the Israelites universally? Again, if the reference is to past times, the question arises what particular period had the prophet in view? (Compare on this subject *Camp. Vitringa* de Synag. vetere p. 335—347). From v. 4 it is evident that the prophet is speaking of something, which had been confirmed by the history of Israel; and in v. 5 seq. it becomes still more apparent, that he refers to times gone by. The fact that God only suffers himself to be found by a faithful nation had been learned by experience, not by the southern kingdom or the northern kingdom alone, but by the whole of Israel, and especially in the time of the judges. Particular expressions in vv. 4, 5, and 6 remind us directly of the descriptions of the state of Israel during the period of the Judges, and from these we may infer that that is the period referred to here. At the same time there is no doubt that the passage before us contains a general description of the relation of God to Israel, the truth of which is established not merely by the history of the Judges, but by the whole of the history of Israel, so far as our historian could trace it; for it is evident, from the address itself, that the historian reports the address of the ancient prophet in his own way and with his own words. *And for many days the nation of Israel had no true God, and no*

teaching priest and no law; לְלֹא is the expression used in the text, not לְאֵין (if the latter had been the term employed the meaning would be: *so that there was no true God*, &c., 1 Chr. xxii. 4, 2 Chr. xx. 25); even without the repeated ל before לֹא the words would be intelligible, and must be rendered in the manner already indicated; the *lamed* is, therefore, inserted according to later usage merely to give prominence to the different nouns which are connected immediately with לֹא, cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 6. The assumption that לְלֹא means *without* in this passage is quite arbitrary. *Many days;* this is an accusative of time, Jer. xxxii. 14.—אלהי אמת, cf. אלהי אמן, Is. lxv. 16, and אלהים אמת Jer. x. 10, where אמת is in apposition to *Elohim*. It is in vain to seek for any confirmation of the opinion that the "*teaching priest*" means the high priest, and *Vitringa's* method of explaining the words by asserting that there was no high priest between Phinehas and Eli is altogether inadmissible, for we have an unbroken series of high priests named in 1 Chr. v. 30 seq., and it is *a priori* improbable that our historian should intend to say that *for a long time* there was no high priest, in direct opposition to the view which so decidedly prevailed in late times, that the succession of high priests had been unbroken. The simple design of the passage is to picture in grand outlines the general condition of the people during the period of the apostasy, when the mass of the Israelites had turned to idols, paying no attention to the instructions of the true Jehovah-priests and acting without regard to the law. The words of the prophet, therefore, must be interpreted according to the other descriptions of a similar kind, relating to the general condition of the people, *e.g.* in such passages as Judges ii. 11, iii. 7, cf. Deut. iv. 27—31.—V. 4. See Deut. iv. 29, seq. Judges ii. 15.—V. 5. *And in those very times;* the times of the apostasy described in v. 3. *For him who went out and for him who came in;* all free communication was interrupted, cf. Judges v. 6 and vi. 2. *Great vexations*, Amos iii. 9; in Deut. xxviii. 20 Jehovah is said to have sent *Mehomah* as a punishment of apostasy. The plural הארצות (*the countries*), so frequently employed by this historian, can only refer in the present connexion to the countries of Israel, *i.e.* to the different provinces

of the country inhabited by the Israelites, cf. chap. xxxiv. 33.—V. 6. *And there were beaten in pieces;* the Pual of נתת only occurs in this passage; in some MSS. the word is pointed וְנֻכְּתוּ, but in by far the greatest number and the best we find the Pual. It is quite in harmony with the rhetorical nature of the passage that the contentions of the Israelites among themselves (*e.g.* in the time of the Judges between the inhabitants of Gilead and Ephraim, and between Benjamin and the rest of the tribes, Judges xii., 4 seq. xx.—xxi., and in later times between the two Israelitish kingdoms) should be described as a crushing of one people by the other (גוי-בגוי). *For God had confounded them with all kinds of oppressions,* the result of which had been the dissolution of the state and civil war, cf. Is. ix. 18—20. *But you, be strong,* &c., do not cease to adhere faithfully to Jehovah, for as ye have conquered Zerach and his army through the help of Jehovah, so will Jehovah help you still; on the last clause see Jer. xxxi. 16. V. 8. *These words and the prophecy:* the words of the prophet *were* the prophecy, hence the meaning must be: *these words and* (to use a more expressive term) *the prophecy. Oded the prophet;* the prophecy was not delivered by Oded, but according to v. 1 by Azariah ben Oded. The difficulty presented by this passage cannot be solved by assuming that, through an error on the part of a copyist, the original words Oded ben Azariah were transposed in v. 1, so as to read Azariah ben Oded (Movers p. 261), or by the supposition that Oded, the actual composer of the address, commissioned his son Azariah to deliver it (*Knobel* Prophetismus ii. p. 68), for the word הנבואה, in the absolute state with the article, would still have to be explained, and we are not at liberty to say, without further reasons, that it is used here in the sense of the construct נְבוּאַת (*e.g.* chap. ix. 29). The *Vulgate* and *Septuagint* (Cod. Alex.) read Oded in verse 1 instead of Azariah ben Oded, but this can only be regarded as an unsuccessful attempt to improve a corrupt text. The sole remedy is to erase the words "*of Oded the prophet,*" which are probably the remains of a marginal note, referring the prophecy to Azariah ben Oded mentioned in v. 1, which crept from the margin into the text. In the Arabic version the words "*of Oded the prophet*" are omitted, but we cannot lay much stress upon this. *He took courage;* Asa for his part

complied with the injunction in v. 7 "*be ye strong;*" the Hithpael is written here as in chap. xiii. 7, with *patach* in the last syllable. By "*the cities which he had taken from Mount Ephraim,*" we are no doubt to understand those which had been taken by Asa's father Abijah, chap. xiii. 19. *He renewed* (chap. xxiv. 4) *the altar of Jehovah, which was before the porch of Jehovah* (chap. viii. 12), *i.e.* the altar of burnt-offering; as it is evident from the context that the renewal can only denote a *restoration of the altar to the worship of Jehovah,* we must assume that under the predecessors of Asa it had been defiled by idolatrous priests. אוּלָם with Kamez in the last syllable, which is retained in this word in the construct state; cf. 1 Kings vii. 7, 12; Ezek. xl. 7.—V. 9. As *strangers, i.e.* Israelites belonging to other tribes, had flocked at an earlier period into the southern kingdom (chap. xi. 16), so did they now come in the time of Asa, when they saw that he was a pious king, and was desirous of restoring the worship of Jehovah, cf. chap. xxx. 11, 18. It is striking that among the strangers mentioned there are members of the tribe of Simeon, for the inheritance of Simeon was in the province of Judah, and in the historical books it is always taken for granted that the tribe of Simeon belonged to the southern kingdom. It is evidently out of the question to infer from this passage and the similar words in chap. xxxiv. 6, that Simeon was one of the ten tribes of the northern kingdom. The account given here might be explained on the assumption that some of the Simeonites, who were living at that time outside their own province, possibly within the limits of the northern kingdom, came up to Jerusalem to take part in the festival instituted by Asa. *They fell to him;* see 1 Chr. xii. 19 seq.—V. 11. *On that day; i.e.* the day on which the festival was celebrated in the third month of the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa. The clause, "*they offered of the spoil,*" which is attached without the copula, contains a more exact definition of the foregoing sentence; the perfect must therefore be rendered by the present participle "*offering of the booty.*" There were no *oxen* mentioned among the animals taken as plunder, chap. xiv. 14.—V. 12. *And they entered into the covenant,* they bound themselves in a solemn manner, *to seek,* &c.; on בּא בּברית, followed by the infinitive with *lamed,* see Jer. xxxiv. 10, and Nehem. x. 30.—V. 13. The obligation did not stop

there, they also engaged that *every one, who would not seek Jehovah the God of Israel, should be put to death ;* see the more precise injunctions in the law in Deut. xvii 2—6.—V. 14. The loud music, with which the conclusion of the covenant was accompanied, is noticed very briefly here; compare the more precise descriptions in chap. xxiii. 13; Nehem. xii. 27—43.—V. 15. *All Judah,* the whole of the southern kingdom; they *rejoiced at the oath,* on account of its results, for *with all their heart they had sworn, &c., and he suffered himself to be found of them* (v. 2), and God gave them rest *round about.*

Vv. 16—18. *Further particulars respecting Asa's conduct in religious matters;* compare 1 Kings xv. 13—15, which agrees almost word for word with this passage. (See also the commentary on Kings.—Tr.)—V. 17. *Out of Israel ;* the context shows that the northern kingdom is not intended here. After "*perfect*" we find "*with Jehovah*" in 1 Kings; the high places he did not remove, only he himself was attached to God, devoted to him, *i.e.* he did not worship Jehovah upon the high places, but in the temple at Jerusalem. This is not at variance with either the account contained in chap. xvi. 7—10 of his conduct towards the prophet Hanani and some of the people, or his behaviour during his last illness, chap. xvi. 12.—V. 18. We are not told where the offerings (1 Chr. xxvi. 26), which Asa's father Abijah ought to have brought to the temple of Jehovah as part of the booty after his splendid victory over Jeroboam (chap. xiii. 16—19), had been kept till now, when Asa brought them into the temple. It has been assumed by earlier expositors that Abijah had placed them among the things that had been dedicated to idols; but it is just as reasonable to suppose, that he applied them to the improvement of the royal treasury. The offerings of Asa himself were part of the plunder obtained on the occasion of his victory over Zerach (chap. xiv. 12). *Thenius* very justly points out how the statements in 1 Kings xv. 15 "serve to confirm the accounts given in the Chronicles of the victories of Abijah and Asa," whilst the latter again furnishes an explanation of the former.

V. 19—Chap. xvi. 6. *Baasha the King of the northern kingdom invades Judah.* cf. 1 Kings xv. 16—22. Verse 19 is closely connected with chap. xvi. 1, and must therefore be interpreted

thus: *and there was no war* (with Baasha) *till the thirty-fifth year of Asa's reign;* (and according to chap. xvi. 1) *but in the thirty-sixth year, &c.* But this does not remove the difficulty which is caused by the chronological statement here made, for, according to 1 Kings xv. 33, Baasha ascended the throne in the third year of Asa's reign, and died after reigning twenty-four years, that is, in the twenty-seventh year of the reign of Asa. Earlier commentators thought that the two accounts could be harmonised by assuming that the thirty-five years were reckoned from the rise of the southern kingdom (*annum* 35 *regni Asae, h. e. regni Judae cui Asa præerat,* Rambach and the earlier theologians); the thirty-fifth year of the kingdom of Judah is the fifteenth year of Asa's reign, and the war with Baasha would thus have broken out in Asa's sixteenth year. But it is evident that we cannot rest contented with this assumption, for "*the reign of Asa*" is expressly mentioned in this and the following verse, and the assertion that there was no war in the first thirty-five years of the existence of the southern kingdom, would stand in open contradiction to the account of the war between Abijah and Jeroboam, in chap. xiii. The chronology must therefore be at fault here. *Thenius* assumes, that "in 2 Chr. xiii. 23 the ten should be altered into six, and in this passage the thirty-five into five (the thirty may have arisen by mistake from the introduction of ל = 30 caused by the eye wandering to the word למלכות which follows immediately afterwards); and in the same way the thirty-six must be altered into six in chap. xvi. 1, so that the sense of the passage would be: till the sixth year Asa had rest, and in the sixth year the war broke out between him and Baasha. In this case the invasion of Zerach must have taken place at a subsequent period. The whole would thus be arranged in perfect order." But not without many alterations, and the same result can be attained by a shorter road. If we assume that the original reading of the verse before us was "the 15th year of the reign of Asa," this number may easily have been changed by mistake into 35; and the number thirty-five may even more readily have found its way into the text, if some reader, from a desire to give still greater precision to the chronological datum, wrote in the margin that the 15th year of Asa's reign was the 35th year from the rise of the southern kingdom, and

the thirty-five crept from the margin into the text. If we read fifteen for thirty-five, and sixteen for thirty-six in the next verse, no further change would be required: there was rest for the first ten years of Asa's reign (chap. xiii. 23); during this period the preparations for war were made (chap. xiv. 5); between the tenth and the fifteenth year the invasion of Zerach took place; up to the fifteenth there was no war with Baasha; in the sixteenth the war broke out. There are other ways in which we might try to solve the difficulty, but it can never be solved without altering the present text. It cannot be urged as an objection to the method proposed by us, that the assertion, "*there was no war till the fifteenth year of Asa's reign*," is too startling, when the invasion of Zerach had been mentioned just before; for the context shows that this statement is merely intended to refer to the relation in which Asa stood to Baasha; moreover it may be conjectured without hesitation, that it was taken from a source, which was chiefly occupied with the wars between the kings of the two Israelitish kingdoms. The account given in 1 Kings xv. 16 that there was war between Asa and Baasha throughout their entire reign does not harmonise with the verse before us.—(We quote Keil's explanation here, which differs somewhat from that of Bertheau. He says: the words of the Chronicles are not in irreconcileable contradiction to those of Kings. For when it is said in 1 Kings xv. 32, "there was war between Asa and Baasha all their days," this may be explained as referring not to open war, but to the hostile relation in which the two kingdoms stood to each other, for there is no account in the Book of Kings of any other war between them than the one described in the Chronicles in which Baasha occupied Ramah, a city about thirty miles from Jerusalem that commanded the road to Judah [1 Kings xv. 17 sqq.]. There remains therefore merely the announcement, that this war broke out in the 36th year of Asa's reign, and that there was peace till the 35th, which is at variance with the Book of Kings. If this discrepancy were irreconcileable, we might assume that there was an error in the numbers. But there is no necessity for this. Most commentators and chronologists, and the best of them, regard the 35th year as referring not to the commencement of Asa's reign but to the separation of the kingdoms. In this case it would coincide with the fifteenth year of Asa's reign,

and the war would thus have broken out in the sixteenth, when Baasha was still alive. The objection, that there is no other instance in which the author of the Chronicles reckons the years from the division of the kingdom, may be removed, if we suppose that the source whence this account was taken by the author was one in which such a mode of reckoning was generally adopted. *Chronik.* p. 291—292).

Chap. xvi. 1. *He fortified Ramah* (the modern Ram, about five miles to the north of Jerusalem) *in order that they might give (or send) none going out or coming in to Asa;* that is to say, his intention was to prevent any towards the north from entering into alliance with Asa, and consequently to prevent Asa from forming an alliance with them. The high road from Jerusalem to the north passed by Ramah, and therefore the stoppage of this road must have interrupted the communication with Jerusalem in the most effectual manner. The infinitive תת, which should follow לבלתי according to the ordinary construction, cannot be rendered: *in order that Baasha might not give*, for what he wanted was to prevent freedom of communication.—The fortification of Ramah by Baasha presupposes his recovery of the cities, which had been taken by Abijah from the northern kingdom, and which according to chap. xv. 8 were still in Asa's possession.—V. 2. The account in 1 Kings xv. 18 is more elaborate and precise. (For vv. 2—6 see the Commentary on 1 Kings xv. 16—22). V. 6. In Jeremiah xli. 9 there is a cistern mentioned, which Asa constructed in Mizpah on this occasion. By the fortification of Mizpah and Geba the road from the north to Jerusalem was fully secured.

Vv. 7—10. *Address of the prophet Hanani, and the manner in which Asa received his reproof.*—V. 7. The prophet Hanani is only met with here; his younger contemporary was the prophet Jehu the son of Hanani, whose sphere of labour was in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xvi. 1) and at a later period in the southern kingdom also (2 Chr. xix. 2). It is natural, therefore, to suppose that Jehu the son of Hanani was a son of the Hanani referred to here.—*And hast not relied upon Jehovah thy God* (chap. xiii. 18, xiv. 10), *therefore the army of the king of Aram has escaped out of thy hand:* the meaning is that if Asa had trusted in God, he would not only have defeated the army of

Baasha, but the army of the king of Damascus also, should the latter, which was greatly to be feared, be induced by his alliance with Baasha (v. 3) to make common cause with him and attack the southern kingdom. The first act of Asa, namely his attempt to dissolve the alliance between Damascus and the northern kingdom by means of silver and gold, and the appropriation of the treasures of the temple to that purpose, is blamed, because it indicated a want of faith; and the consequence of this want of faith had been the disappointment of the inspired prophet's hope, that Asa would gain a splendid victory over the king of Damascus on this occasion.—V. 8. By the help of God Asa would have been able to conquer the armies of Damascus; the proof of this is his victory over the large army of Zerach (cf. chap. xiv. 8—12). —V. 9. *For Jehovah, his eyes move round about over the whole earth*, to search for an opportunity of interposing with his miraculous power, *that he may show himself strong in those, whose heart is devoted to him* (see 1 Chr. xi. 10). לבבם שלם אליו is a relative clause governed directly by the preposition עם without אשר; cf. 1 Chr. xv. 12.—*Thou hast acted foolishly on this* (*i.e.*, on this occasion) *for henceforth thou wilt have wars*, whereas by a decisive victory thou wouldst have deprived both the northern kingdom and the kingdom of Damascus of the power and the means of attacking thee. In our historical books we have no account of the wars of Asa, referred to here.—V. 10. The prophetical address of Hanani must have spread discontent with Asa's conduct over a wide circle, for the king proceeded *to cast him into prison, and to punish* some *of the people;* in what way, the word used here (ויריצץ; *Septuagint* καὶ ἐλυμήνατο; *Vulgate*, et interfecit de populo in tempore illo plurimos) does not enable us to determine. The explanatory parenthesis, *for in a rage with him at this* (on that account), is quite intelligible, as we may easily supply from the context the words, "*he acted thus.*"

Vv. 11—14. *Conclusion* (cf. 1 Kings xv. 23, 24).—V. 12. עד למעלה חליו, *his disease having reached a great height*, having become very violent. What was the nature of his disease in the feet we are not told. *Also in his disease he did not seek Jehovah;* seeking here includes the notion of turning to him with confidence, and this explains the fact that at first the verb is

followed by the accusative, and then in the antithetical clause, like all verbs denoting confidence, is construed with the preposition ב. The word גם refers to Asa's conduct in the war with Baasha; as he trusted then in human aid so did he now during his last illness. There is nothing to hinder us from assuming that this remark was occasioned by more precise accounts of Asa's conduct during his illness, and that it is not the fact that he consulted physicians, but the manner in which he relied upon physicians, that is here condemned.—V. 13. From a comparison between this verse and 1 Kings xv. 24 and 10, it is evident that the clause "*and he died in the forty-first year of his reign*," is merely a loosely inserted supplementary statement, which would stand more appropriately *before* the words, *he lay with his fathers*.—V. 14. Asa had had his own private tombs excavated for himself (and his family) in the city of David, possibly because it was necessary to increase the number of the royal tombs. The nominative to מִלְּאוּ need not be Asa; it may be rendered thus: *which they had filled with incense and spices, that had been prepared by means of an ointment into an ointment-like mass;* the Pual מרקחים only occurs here; it is derived from the substantive רקח, and the participle Pual may denote that which has become a רקח by means of artificial preparations, an ointment-like mass. In the preparation of this they employed מרקחת, 1 Chr. ix. 30, a word which certainly denotes an *ointment;* whether it also denoted the cauldron used in the preparation of the ointment, as some commentators suppose, is very uncertain. מעשה, as we may see at once, must be interpreted according to Ex. xxx. 25, 35; earlier expositors supply רוקח from these passages, and render the words: by an ointment *of the work of the ointment-maker;* it is possible that מרקחת מעשה may be an abbreviated technical term, but it is just as possible that in this instance רוקח may have been left out of the text by mistake. *They kindled for him a very, very great fire* (chap. xxi. 9; Jer. xxxiv. 5); according to the latter passage the kindling of a fire, that is the burning of incense, was customary at the funerals of kings; all that is emphatically noticed here is the fact that an extraordinary quantity was burned when Asa was buried.

The notices of Asa's reign, which are only met with in the Chronicles, are set, as it were, in the framework supplied in the Book of Kings:

2 Chr. xiv. 1—4 = 1 Kings xv. 11, 12.
2 Chr. xiv. 5—xv. 15.
2 Chr. xv. 16—xvi. 6 = 1 Kings xv. 13—22.
2 Chr. xvi. 7—10.
2 Chr. xvi. 11—14 = 1 Kings xv. 23, 24.

The parallel sections are not word for word the same, but it is evident at once that they are derived from a common source. The Book of Kings gives merely a brief extract from a more ample source; and from the relation in which this extract stands to the elaborate account in the Chronicles, we may readily infer, that the notices of Asa, which are only given in the Chronicles, were contained, in part at least, in this source, and in fact in the order in which we have them in this book. There are also references in 1 Kings xv. 23 to the fortifications described in 2 Chr. xiv. 5 seq. and to Asa's prosperous wars, among which the war with Zerach must hold a prominent place. The accounts of the prophet Azariah ben Oded and Hanani may perhaps have been taken by the historian from another source. But he has also recast in his own way what he found in these sources, for we find the peculiar marks of his style and language spread over the whole of these chapters.

4. Chap. xvii.—Chap. xxi. 1.

JEHOSHAPHAT.

Chap. xvii. *Jehoshaphat's anxiety for the security of his kingdom* (vv. 2 and 10—19); *his endeavours to root out idolatry and to spread both laws and the knowledge of religion among the people* (vv. 3—9.)—V. 1. *And he strengthened himself against Israel*, i.e., against the northern kingdom; the words cannot be interpreted in any other way, the northern kingdom being called Israel in this passage (v. 4) and the southern Judah (v. 5). It

was not during the first years of his reign that Jehoshaphat became related to Ahab by marriage and formed an alliance with the northern kingdom (chap. xviii. 1), and it was during those years that the attitude of the northern kingdom rendered it necessary for the southern to make preparations for defence.—V. 2. The warlike preparations were the following, the fortresses of Judah were garrisoned with troops, and military posts (נְצִיבִים 1 Chr. xi. 16) were established in the land of Judah and in the cities of Mount Ephraim which were subject to Jehoshaphat (cf. chap. xv. 8).—V. 3. *In the earlier ways of David his father*, the earlier ways, in contrast with the later (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 29), refer to David's conduct during the early part of his reign; hence his conduct in his later years, in which the adultery with Bathsheba (2 Sam. xi. sqq.) and the numbering of the people occurred, is not to be taken into account in the comparison which is here established between Jehoshaphat and David. The *Baalim*, which are placed in contrast with *the God of his father* (David), are idol deities in general, Judg. ii. 11. דָּרַשׁ *sought not*; for the use of *lamed* after the verb see 1 Chr. xii. 19.—V. 4. In the last clause "*and not after the doings of Israel*" we must supply the previous verb "*he walked*;" by *the doings of Israel* we are to understand the worship of Jehovah in the form of a small ox, or of the golden calves at Bethel and Dan, 1 Kings xii. 28 seq. According to v. 3 Jehoshaphat abstained from idolatry, and according to v. 4 from the worship of the northern kingdom also.—V. 5. Then God established the government *in his hand*, 2 Kings xiv. 5. As it is expressly stated all Judah sent *presents* to Jehoshaphat (compare the presents the Philistines, v. 11), we are naturally led to think of free offerings, not of the ordinary taxes, which were paid to the royal treasury. The last clause of the verse occurs again in chap. xviii. 1 (cf. chap. i. 12).—V. 6. *His heart was high*; not, he was proud (chap. xxvi. 16, xxxii. 25), for so depreciatory a remark the context would by no means lead us to expect (vv. 3—6), nor is there any reason assigned for such an observation; moreover it would not tally with the sentence pronounced on Jehoshaphat's conduct in other parts of the chapters under review *e.g.* chap. xix. 3). We must take וַיִּגְבַּהּ therefore in a favourable sense: *his heart was exalted by the ways of Jehovah*, that is,

he walked in the ways of Jehovah himself and therefore possessed alacrity and firmness enough to promote the general diffusion of the worship of Jehovah in his kingdom by the destruction of idols. *And further* he took away from Judah the high places and the pillars; עוד refers to v. 3, he not only abstained from idolatry, but besides that he removed, &c. This is the explanation generally given by expositors, *Capellus* alone is of opinion that the reference here is to the pride of Jehoshaphat, the effect of which is said to have been that he did *not* put an end to idolatry in his kingdom, and in order to put this meaning into the verse he proposes to read ולא instead of ועוד; but he appeals without reason to chap. xx. 33 in defence of this alteration in the reading, for the statement, which we find there, "*the high places did not cease to exist*," is not at variance with that contained in the verse before us, "*he removed the high places*," cf. chap. xiv. 2. The announcement that Jehoshaphat abolished idolatry is most intimately connected with the account in vv. 7—9, in which we are informed of his efforts to spread the knowledge of the religion of Jehovah throughout his land. In the third year of his reign Jehoshaphat sent five princes, that is, five laymen of distinction, along with nine Levites and two priests, with instructions to travel through all the cities of Judah, *having with them the book of the law of Jehovah*, that they might give to the people everywhere accurate instruction in the laws. *Ben-chail*, according to the Hebrew text and the Vulgate, is a proper name; but the Syriac and Septuagint translators read בני־חיל τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν δυνατῶν; no doubt this is the only place in which we meet with Ben-chail as a proper name, but we need not feel any more hesitation to regard it as the name of a man, than Benchesed in 1 Kings iv. 10 and other similar names. The name *Tob-adonijah* in v. 8 we meet with in this passage alone. The men named here are not mentioned anywhere else in the historical books of the Old Testament. *The book of the law of Jehovah* is probably a term employed by the historian to denote our present Pentateuch, and even if this was not in existence in the time of Jehoshaphat in the form in which we have it now, there was certainly a collection of Mosaic laws, which the men whom Jehoshaphat sent through the land may have been commissioned to make known to the people.—V. 10.

Jehoshaphat had leisure to provide for the instruction of his people, as the neighbouring tribes did not venture to make war upon Judah. By this remark, in which we at once detect expressions peculiar to the historian (*"fear of Jehovah,"* cf. chap. xiv. 13, xx. 29; *"all the kingdoms of the lands,"* cf. chap. xii. 8; and many other passages), he takes up the thread of the narrative concerning Jehoshaphat's military power, which was dropt at v. 2.—V. 11. כֹּחֵן פְּלִשְׁתִּים must be taken as the subject: *and some of the Philistines brought.* נְכֹסֶף מַשָּׂא, not *silver of tribute*, as מַשָּׂא does not occur anywhere else in this signification, but *a great quantity of silver.* מַשָּׂא, that which is carried on men's shoulders (chap. xxv. 3) or on the backs of beasts of burden (Isa. xlvi. 1), may mean *the burden, i.e.*, that which can only be carried, hence a large quantity; cf. chap. xx. 25, לְאֵין מַשָּׂא. By the *Arbihim* we must understood Arabian tribes, which had probably sought the protection of Jehoshaphat after his conquest of Edom. In the reign of Jehoram (chap. xxi. 16) the Philistines and Arabians were once more dangerous enemies of the southern kingdom.—V. 12. The participle הוֹלֵךְ before וַיִּגְדַּל, like the infinitive (for example in Gen. viii. 3), indicates the continual increase of his strength. בִּירְנִיּוֹת (only used here and chap. xxvii 4) a noun derived from the adjective בִּירָנִי, which is formed from בִּירָה, a *castle*, a word frequently met with in the historical books. On the *store-cities* see chap. viii. 4.—V. 13. מְלָאכָה רַבָּה ("much business," *Eng. V.*) must, from the context, refer to the works connected with the preparation and provisioning of the fortresses (*i.e.*, the cities of Judah), chap. xi. 11.—V. 14. The superscription, *"and this is their census according to the house of their fathers,"* refers to the fact that the numbers about to be given were taken from an account of the warriors, who were arranged in the army according to their fathers'-houses.—*To Judah* belonged; in v. 17 there follows, *"and of Benjamin"* there were. *The princes of thousands* were the highest officers in command; there were three of them, and *Adnah* held the highest post. Attached to the different names we find after this only the shorter title *"the prince."*—V. 15. עַל יָדוֹ refers back to Adnah in v. 14: by the side of him, who commanded the largest division, Johanan and Amaziah had the

command of 280,000 and 200,000 men. Why Amaziah received the honourable distinction, "*he who had willingly given himself to Jehovah*," we are not informed. In the fuller account, from which this remark has been taken, there was no doubt some notice of a high-minded deed of Amaziah, which would explain the allusion, though now it is unintelligible.—V. 17. One company of the Benjamites consisted of archers, who are here described as *shooting with the bow* (cf. 1 Chr. xii. 2) *and* (armed with) *shields*, the word נשקי being made to refer by Zeugma to both מגן and קשת. Besides the archers, who always formed the principal force of the tribe of Benjamin (cf. Judges xix.—xx), the Benjaminites contributed 180,000 *equipped* men *of the army*, by which we understand the heavy armed soldiers in contradistinction from the archers. According to this account the army of Jehoshaphat was composed of five great divisions; Judah contributed 780,000 men in three divisions, and Benjamin 380,000 men in two divisions. The five divisions of the army may perhaps have been connected with some existing division of the provinces of Judah and Benjamin into five counties.—V. 19. Besides these five leading generals Jehoshaphat had other officers, who were entrusted with the command of the fortresses in the southern kingdom (*in all Judah*), where portions of the troops described above were no doubt stationed as garrisons.

Chap. xviii. *Jehoshaphat's connexion with Ahab by marriage; their joint attack upon Ramoth; death of Ahab.* Compare 1 Kings xxii. 2—35. (See the commentary on that passage).

Chap. xix. 1—3. *Sentence pronounced by the prophet Jehu on Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab.*—V. 1. Jehoshaphat *returned to his house in peace*; thus the prediction of Micah (chap. xviii. 16) was fulfilled.—V. 2. *Jehu the son of Hanani* (chap. xx. 34) had his sphere of action in the northern kingdom at the time of king Baasha (1 Kings xvi. 1); he may possibly have been banished from the northern kingdom, and compelled on that account to take up his abode in the southern.—*Should one help the wicked*; how couldst thou make common cause with Ahab? On the infinitive with *lamed* see 1 Chr. v. 1; ix. 25, &c. The accusative ושנאי, which is placed first for the sake of emphasis, has the *lamed* attached to it as the sign of the accusa-

tive. On the last clause of the verse, see 1 Chr. xxvii. 24. Instead of "*wrath from before Jehovah*" we find in 2 Chr. xxxii. 26, "the wrath of Jehovah." We are to regard the dangerous attack made by the eastern tribes (chap. xx. 1—30) as the consequence of the wrath, which Jehoshaphat had drawn upon himself by his conduct; but the danger passed over because (v. 3) "*there are, nevertheless, good things also found in thee*" (chap. xii. 12; 1 Kings xiv. 13). On the last clause see chap. xii. 14, xvii. 4.

V. 4—11. *Jehoshaphat's measures for securing a proper administration of justice.*—V. 4. וַיָּשָׁב *(and he turned back)* is to be taken in connexion with the following verb, thus: *then he went out again among the people; again,* for though it is not stated in chap. xvii. 7 sqq. that Jehoshaphat had personally gone out, yet these words may refer to the passage cited, so as to mean: he resumed his efforts for the instruction of the people. *Mount Ephraim* denotes the northern frontier of the southern kingdom. "And brought them back," see chap. xxiv. 19. As this reformatory movement had been already described, it is but briefly referred to here, so as to form a point of connexion between the account of the arrangements made for the administration of justice and the previous narrative (chap. xvii. 7—9).—V. 5. *The fortified cities* were appointed as the residences of the judges, because they were the central points for the traffic of the districts in which they were situated. לְעִיר וְעִיר *with reference to each particular city* (compare the law in Deut. xvi. 18). *Ye shall not judge for men, i.e.* not at their dictation or in compliance with their wishes, *but for Jehovah.* וְעִמָּכֶם בִּדְבַר מִשְׁפָּט these words are very obscure on account of their brevity, and they are variously rendered in the ancient versions; *e.g.* in the *Vulgate* they are given thus: *et quodcumque judicaveritis, in vos redundabit.* The simplest method is to supply the word "Jehovah" from the previous clause (compare the conclusion of v. 11 and chap. xx. 17): *and Jehovah be with you in the affair of justice (i.e.* in your decisions, Deut. xvii. 9), so that with a consciousness of his presence ye may earnestly seek that which is right. The next verse harmonises very well with this interpretation.—V. 7. שִׁמְרוּ וְעֲשׂוּ, correctly translated in the *Vulgate, cum diligentia cuncta facite. For there is no injus-*

tice, or regard of person, or receiving of presents with Jehovah, and therefore this must not take place on the part of judges, who judge *for Jehovah* (see the law, Deut. xvi. 19).—V. 8. From this verse we may conclude, that in the fortified cities, (v. 5) as well as in Jerusalem, priests, Levites, and the heads of the fathers'-houses were appointed as judges. לישראל with the *lamed* of direct dependence: *some of the heads of the fathers' houses* (1 Chr. viii. 6) *of the Israelites. He appointed the Levites*, &c. (1) *for the judgment of Jehovah*, or, as it is stated in v. 11, *for all matters of Jehovah*, for the affairs of religion and worship, *e.g.* to decide in any disputes with regard to the redemption of the first-born, or the payments to the temple, and in any questions as to purification; (2) *for the dispute*, or, as it is explained in v. 11, for all the king's matters, to give judgment in civil disputes or state prosecutions. וישבו ירושלם; this does not mean that the Levites and others, who had been appointed, *returned to Jerusalem*, for nothing has been said about their leaving Jerusalem, nor that those who sought for justice *went to Jerusalem*, for שוב does not mean to have recourse to; but it is a supplementary remark, induced by the recollection of the expression in v. 4, *he went out*, and means: *Jehoshaphat* (and those who had gone out with him) *returned to Jerusalem*.—V. 9, 10. The validity of the court of justice in Jerusalem is established. *Thus shall ye do in the fear of Jehovah*, &c.; what they are to do is mentioned in v. 10, where the words כה תעשון are repeated in the last clause. The ו before כל־ריב is wanting in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. The connexion between the announcement in v. 9 and the account in v. 10 becomes more apparent if we erase it from the Hebrew text: *thus shall ye do, every dispute which come before you*, &c. *Those of your brethren who dwell in their cities* (and wish for a decision, or for instruction on the part of the supreme court in the following matters); cf. Deut. xvii. 8. It follows as a matter of course that the dwellers in their cities included the inhabitants of Jerusalem. בין דם לדם *between blood and between blood* (*ben* followed by *lamed*, cf. Gen. i. 6); if there is any dispute respecting a murder or a homicide, and an uncertainty as to which of the laws given in Ex. xxi. 12 sqq. is applicable to the

case; cf. Deut. xvii. 8. *And between law and between commandment, between statutes and between judgments;* this might be expressed more briefly thus: בין־תּוֹרָה לְתוֹרָה, but instead of the second *Thorah*, the different elements of which the Thorah was composed are given. The meaning is: if there be any dispute as to the interpretation or application of the laws; in Deut. xvii. 8, two particular cases are mentioned instead of the general notice given here. *Thus shall ye instruct them* (viz. those who bring the dispute before you) *that they trespass not against Jehovah*, for first of all they would trespass by a false application and interpretation of the laws, and then they would involve the whole nation in guilt as well; and (in this case) *there will be wrath upon you and your brethren*, even upon all Israel. *Thus shall ye do* (viz. according to v. 9 in the fear of Jehovah) *that ye may not trespass.*—V. 11. The high-priest Amariah is described in 1 Chr. v. 37 as the fifth high-priest from Zadok the contemporary of David; and Jehoshaphat the king was also the fifth king from David. *Zebadiah the prince of the house of Jehovah* is only mentioned in this passage. For *the matters of Jehovah* and *the king's matters*, compare v. 8.—עליכם they shall be *over you*, as your presidents, the *Levites shall be officers before you*, as your assistants and servants; a few only of the Levites were appointed as judges, together with some priests, and heads of fathers'-houses (v. 8). The officers of justice, scribes, &c., were also to be taken from the remaining body of Levites. *Be strong and work;* work with strength (cf. v. 7, "take heed and do)." *With the good;* if ye endeavour to fulfil the duties of your office as good judges (cf. v. 6).

Chap. xx. 1—30. *Invasion on the part of the Eastern nations; they destroy one another, and thus perish without being defeated by Jehoshaphat and the Jews.*—V. 1. *Hillerus* (Onom.) says that the מהעמונים must have been the nation of the Meunites; in the Septuagint (*καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν Μιναιῶν*) the translators have adopted neither the reading מִן־הָעַמֹּנִים, which is perfectly unintelligible and not in accordance with vv. 10, 22, and 23, nor the thoroughly suitable reading מֵהַמְעוֹנִים.—On the settlements of the Meunites see 1 Chr. iv. 41; in the further course of the narrative they are designated inhabitants of Mount Seir, v. 23,

or called by the name of their country, the mountains of Seir, vv. 10, 22. *Josephus* (Antiquities ix. 1, 2) speaks of them as a great multitude of Arabs.—V. 2. There *came* (fugitives and messengers) מֵאֵרָם; as they invaded Judah from the country to the east and south east of the Dead Sea (מֵעֵבֶר לַיָּם) they cannot have come straight from Aram: it has been said that they were accompanied by troops from *Aram*, from the Syrian provinces, but there is nothing to this effect in the narrative. Earlier expositors *(e.g. Calmet)* admitted that for *Aram* we should read *Edom;* the Septuagint and Vulgate have the false reading *Aram*, but the Syriac appears to have read Edom, (the clause is rendered thus: from the remote districts by the Red Sea). The hostile tribes marched round the southern point of the Dead Sea, and entered Judah from Edom. *Hazazon-tamar, which is Engedi*, cf. Gen. xiv. 7; the situation of Engedi has been accurately described by *Robinson* (ii. 439, 440), *Lynch* and others.—V. 3. *Jehoshaphat set his face* (he resolved, cf. 2 Kings xii. 18; Jer. xlii. 15) *to seek Jehovah, i.e.* to turn to him and implore his aid (chap. xv. 12, 13), and the consequence of his resolution was that he summoned all the inhabitants of his kingdom to meet at the sanctuary for a solemn fast (cf. Judges xx. 26; Joel. ii. 15).—V. 4. *To ask of Jehovah;* we naturally supply the word "*help*" (cf. Ezra viii. 21). At the end. of the verse we find the words "*to seek the Lord*" in almost the same sense, chap. xi. 16. The numerous attendance at the assembly is thus described: "and Judah (that is, the inhabitants of the southern kingdom) gathered themselves together, even *out of all the cities of Judah* they came."—V. 5. *In the assembly of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the other inhabitants of the southern kingdom;* the former are specially mentioned again in v. 27 (see also Is. i. 1, and ii. 1) as constituting the most important part of the whole population. *Before the new court, i.e.* before the outer court, so that Jehoshaphat stood in front of those who were assembled there, when he offered the prayer vv. 6—12. From this it is evident that the new court must denote the place in which the congregation assembled, that is the outer court; at least this was Solomon's arrangement, for in chap. iv. 9 it is expressly stated that he built the great, *i.e.* the outer court. The name "*new* court" must therefore have

been given to it at a later period, possibly in the time of Jehoshaphat, either because it was enlarged, or from its being rebuilt. With the prayer of Jehoshaphat compare the prayer of Asa, chap. xiv. 10.—V. 6. Cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 12. *There is no one near thee so as to be able to offer resistance, i.e.*, according to chap. xiv. 10, thou alone canst resist the powerful enemies, who have attacked us; these words of course imply that they cannot resist God: the same verb is used in 2 Sam. xxi. 5 with this signification.—V. 7. cf. Gen. xiii. 15 seq., xv. 18—21.—V. 8. The promise was fulfilled: "the Israelites dwelt in the land of Palestine, and built therein a sanctuary for thy name (chap. vi. 8, 5, 6), *saying*," *i.e.* expressing their confident expectation in the words of v. 9.—V. 9. A brief summary of the particular cases described in Solomon's prayer chap. vi. 22—39. שְׁפוּט stands by itself in the list, and is not dependent on the other words (not *gladius judicii*, Vulgate; cf. Lev. xxvi. 25); hence it can only mean *judgment, judicial punishment* (LXX. κρίσις, Syr. ܕܝܢܐ); the word occurs nowhere else. *Then will we come before this house and before thee*: assembling in the court and turning our faces to the temple, in which thou dwellest.—Vv. 10, 11. Such a calamity has now befallen us: tribes, *into the midst of whom thou wouldst not let the Israelites come* (*i.e.*, to enter their land), *when they came out of Egypt*, and (though they were strong enough to destroy them) *thou didst not suffer it*, for (merely in obedience to thy command) *they* (the Israelites) *kept far away from them and did not destroy them*—and *behold they* (the ungrateful tribes) *requite us by coming to drive us out of thine inheritance, which thou hast caused us to inherit* (cf. v. 7). The Edomites (the Meunites, v. 1, were inhabitants of Mount Seir, *i.e.*, of the land of Edom) refused to allow the Israelites to pass through their land (Num. xx. 14—21), but the Israelites were ordered to abstain from any hostilities against Edom (Deut. ii. 5 seq.), and also against Moab (ii. 9) and Ammon (ii. 19); see Judges xi. 17 seq. with reference to Edom and Moab.—V. 12 cf. chap. xiv. 10. *And we, we know not what to do*, in the consciousness of our weakness in contrast with our powerful foes we are in utter despair.—V. 13. cf. Judith iv. 9, 10.—V. 14. *Jahaziel*, one of the sons of Asaph, and therefore a Levite, is suddenly filled with the

spirit of Jehovah in the midst of the ceremony and stands forward as a prophet. He was the fifth in descent from a *Mattaniah*, not the Mattaniah mentioned in 1 Chr. xxv. 4, 16 as a contemporary of David, for *he* was a descendant of Heman. There is a Nethaniah, whose name occurs in 1 Chr. xxv. 2, 12, among the sons of Asaph, and by the change of *nun* into *mem* this might easily have been altered into Mattaniah.—V. 15—17. The prophet calls upon the king and all present, to go forth the following day to meet the foe, that they may be witnesses of their destruction by the hand Jehovah.—V. 15. *Be not afraid nor dismayed;* the two Hebrew verbs employed in this passage are found together in 1 Chr. xxii. 13, Deut. i. 21, and many other places.—V. 16. The names Hazziz and Jeruel are not met with any where else, but the situation is clearly described: from Engedi (v. 2) the enemy marched towards Jerusalem, advancing along the mountain road Hazziz, which led up to a Wady (הנחל), at the upper end of which they found themselves before the desert of Jeruel. According to v. 20 the latter was not far from the desert of Tekoa, which stretches away to the south east of Jerusalem, and therefore the desert of Jeruel is to be regarded as a continuation of that of Hazziz. The mountain road Hazziz must therefore have passed through one of the Wadys, which run from the level country on the west of the Dead Sea, through the mountains forming its western border, to the neighbourhood of Engedi (*Robinson* ii. p. 410). The desert of Jeruel may be supposed to be the "large flat district called el-Husâsah from a Wady on its northern side" of which Robinson speaks in ii. p. 480. "The name Hazziz (Septuagint *Ἀσσεὶς*) has probably been retained in that of the present Wady Husâsah; . . . . for there is no necessity to suppose that the ה is part of the article" (*Ewald*, Gesch. 190).—V. 17. *Ye must not fight in this; i.e.*, because Jehovah himself will fight, compare chap. xix. 2 for the expression "*in this*"). עמכם is appended as a dependent relative clause: *the help of Jehovah who is with you.*—V. 18 seq. Account of the joyful thanksgiving for the glorious promise: the king and all the congregation bow low before Jehovah, the Levites then rise up first to praise God with a loud voice. There is something striking in the expression "*of the Kohathites and of the Korahites,*" as the latter belonged to the descendants of Kohath,

(1 Chr. vi. 22).—V. 20 seq. According to the prophet's command the assembled Israelites went the next day, not to fight but to be witnesses of the miraculous deliverance effected by Jehovah. Jehoshaphat stood there (probably in the gate of Jerusalem, where the people assembled preparatory to departing), and with solemn words exhorted them to believe in Jehovah and his prophets (the Hiphil and Niphal האמין and תאמנו occur together in the same way in Is. vii. 9, cf. Deut. i. 32; Is. xxviii. 16), and having thus exhorted the people he arranged the solemn procession "*he appointed singers of Jehovah* (not *the* singers of Jehovah, but singers generally, hence the word is not in the construct state but governed indirectly by *lamed*, as in the expression *mizmor l'David*, a Psalm of David), who *sang praises in sacred costume on their going out in front of the army and said, &c.*—V. 21. החלו the relative is indispensable in such a connection: *at the time when they began the singing and praise, Jehovah placed* מארבים *against the sons of Ammon, &c., and they destroyed one another*, in the manner described in v. 23. It is evident from the context, that מארבים can only mean angels, powers sent by God, who were called *insidiatores* on account of the part they had to perform in relation to the army of the hostile tribes. This is the explanation given by the earlier expositors (cf. *Rambach* in loco) and by *Ewald* (Gesch. p. 190). We only observe in addition that the מארבים cannot have been Jews placed in ambush, for, according to vv. 15 and 17, the Jews were not to fight, but to be simply witnesses of the destruction effected by divine power; nor can they have been certain portions of the army of the Moabites, Ammonites, and inhabitants of Mount Seir, who destroyed the rest of the army, for the *Mearbim* do not fight, they only cause the different parts of the hostile army to fight one against another.—V. 23. First Moab and Ammon combined together and fell upon the inhabitants of Mount Seir for the purpose of utterly destroying them (Dan. xi. 44), *and when they had finished among* (or in the midst of) *the inhabitants of Seir they helped to destroy one another*, (Moab and Ammon turned their weapons against each other). משחית is a substantive, it occurs also in chap. xxii. 4; Dan. x. 8; Ezek. v. 16.—V. 24. Thus had the army completed its own destruction during the time occupied by the Jewish procession in

going from Jerusalem to the spot, from which the battle-field could be seen. המצפה is not a watch-tower here, but an elevated situation, the summit of a hill which overlooked the desert of Jeruel (v. 16). אין פליטה *not one having escaped;* not one survived, they all lay there dead.—V. 25. Thus according to the word of the prophet the Jews had not to fight at all, but were able to proceed at once to take possession of the immense amount of booty. בהם *among them* or with them. לרב, *in abundance,* is the accusative of the object meaning "*an abundance.*" The words *recush* and *pegarim* could not be rendered in any other way than "*live animals*" and "*dead animals,*" for as *pegarim* in v. 24 is used to denote the human corpses, and it is evident that they must have lain upon the field of battle, the only dead bodies of which we could possibly think here are the carcases of animals whose trappings and hides may certainly have constituted a booty of no little value. Some MSS. and many old editions (including the Bibl. Brix. employed by *Luther*) read בגדים for פגרים; the *Vulgate* and apparently the *Septuagint* adopt the same reading. In other lists of articles carried off as booty we are generally accustomed to find *clothes* mentioned; and as the alteration of *begadim* into *pegarim* could easily occur, the latter word having been written just before, we need not hesitate to accept *begadim* as the original reading. The רכוש, *moveable goods* (such as cattle, tents, &c.), and the *valuable articles* (cf. Judg. viii. 26) are then appropriately noticed in connection with the *clothes.* לאין משא, they plundered for themselves *till there was no loading,* to such an extent that they could not carry the booty away.—V. 26. *The valley of blessing,* according to these verses, must be looked for near the battle-field, for the Jews, who had been engaged for three days in collecting plunder, assembled on the fourth day in this valley, for the purpose of returning to Jerusalem in solemn procession and betaking themselves to the temple, v. 27 seq. In the neighbourhood of the battle-field there is still to be seen not only a hill called *Kaphar-Barucha,* of which *Jerome* speaks (cf. *Reland* Pal. 356. 685), but at a short distance off a place called *Bereikut,* which has been discovered by modern travellers (*Robinson* iii. 2 p. 863, *Wilkinson,* the lands of the Bible 1. p. 386) and a *Wady Bereikut (Wollcott's* Excursion. *C. Ritter* Erdkunde pt. 15. p. 635). As the ancient name

"*Valley of blessing*" is apparently retained in the Wady Bereikut, and the situation of the Wady squares with the places mentioned in this section, and on the other hand as there is not a word to indicate that the festival in *the valley of blessing* was celebrated in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, we cannot subscribe to the opinion held by those, who consider that the *valley of blessing* was "the valley of Kidron, on the road back to Jerusalem from the desert of Tekoa, to which valley, at least where it touches Jerusalem, tradition continues to give the name of "valley of Jehoshaphat" (*Thenius* cf. *Hitzig* on Joel). When *Joel* (chap. iii. 2. 12) calls the place of the grand divine decision the valley of Jehoshaphat, he does so no doubt because the destruction of the enemies of Israel, which was effected by the miraculous interposition of God in the time of King Jehoshaphat, floated before his mind as a type of the future judgment, but it does not follow from this that the valley, which is now called the valley of Jehoshaphat, must be the same as the valley of blessing mentioned here. The name "valley of Jehoshaphat" does not occur anywhere in the Old or New Testament as the name of a portion of the valley of Kidron, nor is it so called in the works of *Josephus*, though *Eusebius* knew it by that name (cf. Robinson ii. p. 31 sqq).—V. 27. *For Jehovah had given them joy;* the same expression occurs in Ezra vi. 22 and Nehem. xii. 43.—V. 28. The same ceremony was observed on their return as on their departure (v. 21).—V. 29. *There was a dread of God over all the kingdoms of the countries;* compare chap. xvii. 10, where it is clearly stated that the countries intended are those round about Judah, though we should naturally infer that no others could be meant.—V. 30. On the last clause see chap. xv. 15.

V. 31 to Chap. xxi. 1. *Further notices of Jehoshaphat, by which his history is brought to a close* (vv. 31—34 and chap. xxi. 1). *These accounts are divided by a supplementary notice of the fitting out of ships in Ezion-Geber,* vv. 35—37. Vv. 31—33. cf. 1 Kings xxii. 41—44. V. 31. The words "*Jehoshaphat reigned over Judah*" we have already met with in chap. xvii. 1; they are repeated here to serve as an introduction to the notices which follow respecting Jehoshaphat's age when he began to reign, and the number of years that he sat upon the throne.

V. 32. Instead of ממנה we find in 1 Kings the masculine מִמֶּנּוּ; דרך occurs as both masculine and feminine. (See chap. xvii. 3).—V. 33. *But the high places they* (the inhabitants of the southern kingdom) *did not remove*, a statement which is not at variance with chap. xvii. 6, where we read "*moreover he took away the high places*" (see the remarks on that passage). The words "*as yet the people had not firmly directed their hearts unto the God of their fathers*," refer, as the context clearly shows, to the fact that Jehovah was not only worshipped in Jerusalem, but upon the high places also; hence they are substantially the same as those which we find in the parallel passage in 1 Kings: *the people still offered and burnt incense in the high places.* V. 34. *The earlier and the later;* the same expression occurs in 1 Chr. xxix. 29.—Vv. 35—37. *Vessels fitted out at Ezion-Geber;* compare 1 Kings xxii. 48—50, where we find the introductory remark, "*no king had been appointed king in Edom*," the intention of which is to show that as Jehoshaphat ruled over the land of Edom, he was therefore able to fit out vessels in the Edomitish harbour of Ezion-Geber. Whether Jehoshaphat had once more subdued the land of Edom by means of successful wars, or whether he "prudently availed himself of disputes which had arisen in Edom with regard to the succession, and thus established the supremacy of Judah over Edom" (*Thenius*), or whether Edom, notwithstanding its revolt in the time of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.) still remained subject to the Israelites, and all that Jehoshaphat did was to display greater force in the government, which the southern kingdom had exercised over Edom from the time when the nation was divided, our historical books do not enable us to determine.—V. 35. The loose connection "*after this*" contains merely an indefinite statement as to the time, cf. chap. xx. 1; if Ahaziah was king of the northern tribes in the seventeenth year of the reign of Jehoshaphat and reigned only two years (1 Kings xxii. 52), the fitting out of the ships must have taken place in the 17th or 18th year of Jehoshaphat. אתחבר the Aramaean form of הִתְחַבֵּר. *He*, viz. Jehoshaphat, *acted wrongly;* the context shows that the purport of these words is to blame Jehoshaphat for his connection with the king of the northern kingdom (cf. chap. xix. 2); earlier ex-

positors regarded them as directed against Ahaziah, *cujus opera erant impiisima (Vulgate).*—V. 36. *And he joined himself with him to build ships to go to Tarshish;* in 1 Kings we read of *ships of Tarshish,* (*i.e.*, large ships, such as were built to sail to the distant port of Tartessus), which were to sail to Ophir; but here we find, instead of ships of Tarshish, *ships which were designed to sail to Tarshish,* with which design their being built in Ezion-Geber would only harmonize, provided the name of Tarshish is used by the historian to denote that distant eastern country which is usually called Ophir; (compare chap. viii. 18 and ix. 21. See also the totally different explanation given by *Keil* in the commentary on 1 Kings xxii. 48. Tr.)—V. 37. The form of the word דּוֹדָוָהוּ reminds us of the names Hodaviah and Joshaviah, but it stands quite isolated in this passage, and is very striking; Δωδία, the name given in the Septuagint, points to the intelligible form דּוֹדִיָּהוּ *friend of God;* the *Vulgate* read *Dodau,* the Syriac *Dodo* (in the latter the passage is rendered, *Eliezer the son of his relative*). *Mareshah,* cf. 1 Chr. ii. 42. The perfect פָּרַץ in the prophet's address denotes that which will certainly come to pass. *Keil* (p. 308 seq.) endeavours to harmonise the different accounts given in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, or rather he keeps them distinct and refers them to different transactions (see the commentary on Kings, Vol. i. p. 329). Chap. xxi. 1. The last clause, "*and Jehoram his son reigned in his stead,*" forms the commencement of the history of Jehoram (cf. chap. xvii. 1); in other places (*e.g.*, chap. xxiv. 27) they can stand at the end of a verse as they do here.

The brief account of the reign of Jehoshaphat, given in the Book of Kings, is amplified in many respects by the fuller history contained in the Chronicles, which must rest upon definite historical traditions. For (1) in the description of the course adopted by him for spreading the knowledge of the law and securing the due administration of justice among his people, the various details and the names (including that of the high priest Amariah, chap. xix. 11, whom we learn from other sources to have been a contemporary of Jehoshaphat), contain the surest evidence that exact accounts were found by the historian in the documents which he employed. If he worked up the historical

material in his own way (see *e.g.* xvii. 10, xix. 7, 9, and other passages particularly in the words of Jehoshaphat, chap. xix. 6—11), there is no ground for the assumption, that the author desired to increase the importance attached to the institutions of a latter period, by attributing their origin to a pious king of an earlier age; for the names of the men, appointed by Jehoshaphat, were evidently known solely in connection with these arrangements, and they have been handed down to us simply because the historians of a later age felt an interest in describing their official labours.—(2) The same may be said of the preparations made for the defence of the country and the organization of the army, see especially chap. xvii. 15—19.—(3) In the remarkable account of the war, in which the Moabites, the Ammonites, and the Meunites destroyed one another (chap. xx. 1—30), we find, it is true, on every hand the style and language peculiar to our historian (compare *e.g.*, Jehoshaphat's prayer, chap. xx. 6—12 with that of Asa, chap. xiv. 10, the infinitives with *lamed*, chap. xx. 6, 17, למעלה, chap. xx. 19, &c.), but we meet also with historical notices of a very definite character: the localities are minutely described, vv. 16—20; the term "*new court*" is only met with in v. 5, (it must have been taken from a source, in which its recent erection was noticed). The list of ancestors of the Levite Jahaziel (v. 14) is a proof of the fact, that he had attracted the attention of the early historians, who were still in a position to give an account of his pedigree. This exterminating struggle floated before the mind of the prophet Joel, when he called the place of the divine decision the valley of Jehoshaphat (cf. chap. xx. 26). The opinion has been expressed, that in the narrative before us we have merely the shorter account of 2 Kings iii. 25 seq. freely remodelled, but in the Chronicles some of the events described are totally different from those referred to in the Book of Kings, and it is impossible to see how the latter can have supplied a starting point or historical foundation for the statements contained in 2 Chr. xx. Lastly (4) the historian must have had before him notices of the labours of the prophets Jehu and Eliezer (chap. xix. 2, 3, and xx. 37), though he puts the substance of their addresses into his own words (cf. the infinitive with *lamed* and קעת, chap. xix. 2, "*good things*" and "*firmly directing the heart*" chap. xix. 3).—The brief account

in 1 Kings apparently refers to the substance of some of the narratives in the Chronicles: in 1 Ki. xxii. 47 the extermination of idolatry (2 Chr. xvii. 3—6) is noticed; in 1 Ki. xxii. 46 there is a reference to Jehoshaphat's military power, of which we have a more elaborate account in 2 Chr. xvii. 2, 10—19. Again in sections, which we do also find in the Book of Kings, though there are not wanting certain alterations and additions on the part of our historian, yet on the whole they are given in the form in which he found them in the sources he employed. The history of Jehoshaphat, as it lies before us, has not been cast in one mould; the historian followed his sources so closely, that he did not always connect together sections which were intimately related, but took different paragraphs from different sources, and set them down in the connection in which he found them.

5. CHAP. XXI. 2—20.

JEHORAM.

V. 2—4. Jehoshaphat had appointed Jehoram his first-born as his successor; his other six sons, like Rehoboam, he had richly endowed (cf. chap. xi. 22 seq.), and had given them the command of some of the fortified cities. Two of the six were named *Azariah;* but there is sufficient difference in the spelling of the Hebrew names to distinguish the one from the other, the one being spelt Azarja, the other Azarjahu. *Jehiel* was supposed by early Jewish expositors to be the same person as the Hiel mentioned in 1 Kings xvi. 34, but this is not correct, for the latter was a native of Bethel in the northern kingdom.—V. 4. *And Jehoram stood over (i.e.* governed) *the kingdom of his father and strengthened himself* (chap. i. 1). We are not told what it was that induced Jehoram to kill his brethren (cf. v. 13); he slew *some of the princes of Israel* as well, *i.e.* princes of the tribes of Israel, belonging to the southern kingdom, from which we may conclude that Jehoram had to contend against internal divisions and commotions, which may have been stirred up by the brethren themselves, or may possibly have originated in their murder by Jehoram.

Vv. 5—10. (cf. 2 Kings viii. 17—22, and see the commentary on that passage).

Vv. 11—19. *The letter of Elijah and infliction of the sufferings predicted in it.* The occasion of the letter (v. 12—15) is mentioned in v. 11. Not only did Jehoram forsake the God of his fathers, he *also* established *high places on the mountains* of Judah (the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* read "in the cities of Judah);" this must have been for the Phoenician gods, for the word ויזן *(he led away to adultery)* refers to the introduction of Phoenician idolatry (cf. v. 13). וידח *he led* them away *by force from the right way;* this must be explained from Deut. xiii. 6, 11, 14.—V. 13. The Hiphil of זנה occurs nine times in the Old Testament, but only three times in the Chronicles, twice in this verse and once in v. 11. כהזנות בית אחאב; *as the house of Ahab seduced to adultery* (cf. v. 6). *Thy brethren;* cf. v. 4. —V. 14. *The great plague,* announced here, refers to the conquest of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians (v. 16 seq.). —V. 15. *And thou* (wilt be) *in great pain from a disease in thy bowels;* compare the fulfilment of this threat in v. 18. The chronological notice, ימים על ימים *one number of days to another* (just like Is. xxix. 1, *year to year*), renders it probable that the course of the disease up to the time of Jehoram's death occupied a period of two years (cf. v. 18).—V. 16. *Stirred up the spirit of the Philistines* (cf. 1 Chr. v. 26). *The Arabs who* (dwell) *by the side of the Cushites* were Arabian tribes from the southern districts.—V. 17. בקע *to split, to open,* hence to conquer cities (chap. xxxii. 1), here with reference to the conquest of the land of Judah. It is evident from what follows that they conquered Jerusalem also. לבית־המלך, indirect government by means of *lamed: all the discovered property of the king's house;* compare the dependence indicated by the construct state which was not admissible here on account of the article, and the adjective attached to the substantive (see chap. xii. 9). *Except Jehoahaz the youngest of his sons;* in chap. xxii. 1—9 he is called Ahaziah, which name he probably first received, when he became king; on the chronological notice see chap. xxii. 2.—V. 18. לחלי, a second accusative with the government indicated by *lamed: Jehovah smote him in his bowels with a disease.* לאין,

מרפא, still more definitely expressed in chap. xxxvi. 16, "*so that there was no cure.*—V. 19. *And it came to pass at days of days*, when out of a long series of days many had passed away; the same idea is conveyed more briefly by מִיָּמִים alone in Judg. xi. 4, xiv. 8, xv. 1. But this indefinite statement was not sufficient, for the purpose of the writer was to show that the prediction in v. 15 was fulfilled as to the exact period also; he therefore adds, "*and* (in fact) *at the time of the arrival of the end of two times* (we render ימים, a number of days, somewhat more clearly by times), or two periods of time, the extent of which is certainly not stated, but which we do not hesitate to regard as years. The *Vulgate*, the *Syriac*, and most of the commentators give as the translation *two years*, but the text of the original is not לִשְׁנָתַיִם ימים (*e.g.* 2 Sam. xiii. 23); it is only in the *Septuagint* that the exact rendering is given. לימים שנים has, therefore, the same meaning as וימים על ימים in v. 15. עם חליו *in his disease* can only mean while his disease lasted, so that his suffering continued to the very last. The תחלאים רעים are *bad, grievous pains. His people instituted no burning* for him (see on the other hand chap. xvi. 14); the nation made known its sentence upon the deceased monarch by refusing the usual honours at his burial.—V. 20. *Conclusion;* 2 Kings viii. 17. וילך בלא חמדה *discessit a nemine desideratus;* the Vulgate, on the contrary, gives *ambulavit non recte*, but חמדה does not mean good conduct. *But not in the sepulchres of the kings;* a more precise statement, which is not found in the Book of Kings.

6. CHAP. XXII. 1—9.

AHAZIAH.

V. 1; taken from the same source as chap. xxi. 11—19. הראשנים, the elder sons in contradistinction to the youngest one. *The band, which came to the camp along with the Arabians* (probably to the camp of the Jews); we understand this obscure passage to mean that Ahaziah's brothers were attacked

and slain by a band of wild men, who served in the army of the Arabians, possibly against the will of the leaders of the Philistines and Arabians, chap. xxi. 16.

Vv. 2—6. (cf. 2 Kings viii. 26—29.)—V. 2. The age assigned to Ahaziah when he began to reign, forty-two years, does not tally with chap. xxi. 20 and 2 Kings viii. 17; for according to these passages his father Jehoram was thirty-two years old, when he ascended the throne, and reigned eight years. Instead of forty-two we find in 2 Kings twenty-two years old (the latter reading is adopted by the *Syriac* and *Arabic* in the passage before us, but the *Septuagint* says he was twenty years old). The best accredited reading, which we must insert in our text also, is twenty-two years. According to this Jehoram begat Ahaziah, when he was seventeen years old, which would still leave it a remarkable fact that in chap. xxi. 17 and xxii. 1 he is called the youngest son. It is possible that Jehoram may have had other sons before the birth of Ahaziah, though they may have had different mothers, but we can hardly suppose that he was the youngest of forty-two brethren (2 Kings x. 13 seq.) —(On this *Keil* says, "the two accounts in 2 Kings x. 13—14, and 2 Chr. xx. 1—8 can easily be reconciled when we consider the latitude allowed to the use of the word אָח. The expression includes grandsons and other near relatives." Apol. Versuch, p. 414).—*Daughter of Omri*, more exactly granddaughter of Omri; the intention of the writer was simply to show that she was a member of the idolatrous dynasty of Omri.—Vv. 3, 4, given more briefly and in somewhat different words in 2 Kings viii. 27. *His counsellor to do wickedly;* she induced him to join in the idolatry of the northern kingdom, and to enter into alliance with that kingdom, chap. xx. 35. *For they* (the members of the house of Ahab, who were related to him on his mother's side), *they were his counsellors after his father's death;* this simply means that the weak-minded king allowed himself to be swayed by his mother's relations. *To his destruction;* chap. xx. 23. The destruction which came upon him is described in v. 9.—V. 5. *He also walked after their counsel;* the meaning of these words, which are wanting in 2 Kings, evidently is, that Ahaziah went with Joram to the war, hence they establish the correctness of the reading in Kings, "*he went with Joram.*" *Hazael,*

a courtier or commander-in chief of Ben Hadad, and subsequently his successor in the government (2 Kings viii. 8 sqq., xiv. 28). *Ramoth in Gilead*, see 2 Chr. xviii. 28. *The Aramœans smote Joram;* according to v. 6 this is equivalent to "*they wounded him.*" הרמים contracted from הָרָאֻרַמִּים.—V. 6. *In Jezreel* (now called Zerin, *Robinson* iii. 393 seq.), not in Samaria, the capital; possibly they could not take the wounded king farther than Jezreel. In the place of the thoroughly unintelligible expression כִּי־הַמַּכִּים, we must adopt the reading of Kings, מִן־הַמַּכִּים, which good MSS. contain in this passage as well. *Azariah;* hardly another name for Ahaziah, who has already been called by a second name Jehoahaz in chap. xxi. 17; it is merely an error of the pen for Ahaziah, and this name is found in the versions and some of the MSS. *He went down* "from Ramoth, which stands upon an eminence, so that the war was now carried on by the generals." (*Thenius*).

V. 7—9. Compare the more extended account in 2 Kings, chaps. ix. and x. (See also the commentary on that passage. TR.)

7. CHAP. XXII. 10—XXIII. 21.

ATHALIAH, AHAZIAH'S MOTHER.

Vv. 10—12. *Athaliah seizes upon the government.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 1—3.

Chap. xxiii. 1—11. *Jehoiada caused Joash to be proclaimed king.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 4—12.

Vv. 12—15. *Athaliah comes to the temple, and is murdered outside the gates.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 13—16.

Vv. 16—21. *Oath of fidelity to Jehovah administered; Joash is conducted to the palace in solemn procession.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 17—20.

(For chap. xxii. 10—xxiii. 21, see the commentary on 2 Kings xi. 1—20).

8. Chap. xxiv.

JOASH.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xii. 1—3.—Vv. 4—14. *The restoration of the temple and preparation of the necessary furniture.* Compare 2 Kings xii. 4—16. (See the commentary on Kings. Tr.)

Vv. 15—22.—*Death of Jehoiada and apostasy of the people; appearance of the prophet Zechariah and his death.*—V. 15. According to 2 Kings xii. 7, Jehoiada was still engaged in building the temple in the twenty-third year of Joash, hence the events narrated here must belong to the later years of his reign. —V. 17. *They bowed before the king, i.e.* they presented their request in the most obsequious manner, that he would allow them to worship idols. And the weak-minded king did not venture to refuse the petition of the princes of Judah. It is not stated that he worshipped idols himself; he is only blamed for not strictly maintaining the worship of Jehovah. *There was wrath* (from Jehovah) *upon Judah and Jerusalem;* see chap. xxix. 8.—V. 19. Compare Nehem. ix. 26—29.—V. 20. Of the many prophets, who are said in v. 19 to have been sent by God into the midst of Israel, Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada the high priest, is the only one named. Under the power of prophetic inspiration he announced the punishment of God upon the faithless nation, and, by the command of the king, was stoned in the court of the temple. This is the Zechariah, who is called in Matth. xxiii. 35 the son of Barachiah, (cf. Luke xi. 51) *Above the people;* he stood, as we may infer from v. 21 and Matt. xxiii. 35, and addressed the people from the inner court, which was somewhat elevated, and thus he was raised above the people, who were assembled in the outer court. *And wherefore do ye not wish to prosper,* this is the proper rendering of the imperfect with לֹא; if they desired prosperity, they must observe the condition of prosperity, fidelity towards Jehovah. On the last clause see chap. xii. 5, xv. 2. The fulfilment of the threat is described in v. 24.—V. 21. The subject of the verbs is understood: the princes and the people. *In the court of the temple;*

the spot is more minutely described in the New Testament, namely between the temple and the altar, hence he was stoned close to the temple in a place that was peculiarly holy.—V. 22. "*But slew his son;*" Joash is described as the murderer, because his command (v. 21) rendered him guilty of the death of the son of Jehoiada. "*The Lord look upon it and avenge it;*" this prediction, which was uttered in the form of a wish, was afterwards fulfilled (v. 25 seq.).

Vv. 23—26. *Infliction of the punishments announced by Zechariah* (compare 2 Kings xii. 18—22).—Vv. 23, 24. A small army of Syrians defeated the numerous army of Joash. Many of the earlier expositors and *Thenius* assume, that the account given in these verses refers to a totally different occurrence from that described in 2 Kings xii. 18 seq. This is possible, but by no means probable. As neither the Book of Kings nor that of Chronicles refers to more than one campaign of the Syrians, in which the southern kingdom was thoroughly worsted, it is natural to assume that both accounts refer to the same campaign, especially as they complete each other in a most appropriate manner. For it is *a priori* probable, that Joash did not purchase peace by means of the heavy sacrifices, described in 2 Kings, till after a shameful defeat, and of this we have an account in the Chronicles alone. Moreover, the price paid for this peace explains the fact that the Syrians retired without prosecuting their victory further. —לתקופת השנה; that is, a year after Zechariah's death, when the recollection of that event must have been fresh in the minds of the people, and when, therefore, there was no room to doubt that the invasion of the Syrians was the punishment of their apostasy, which he had predicted. *To Jerusalem;* they came near the city to besiege it. *They destroyed all the princes of the people from the people;* the punishment fell upon the princes as the originators of the apostasy (v. 17). מעם has been left untranslated by the *Vulgate* and *Syriac*, the Septuagint has ἐν τῷ λαῷ; according to Ps. lxxxix. 20 the word is added to show that they were singled out from the body of the people, the people generally being spared. *The spoil of them;* as part of the spoil we may include the treasures which Joash is said in the Book of Kings to have handed over to the Syrians.—*Darmesek*, cf. chap. xvi. 2.—V. 24. On the other hand a small number of pious

Israelites had formerly defeated the very large army of the Ethiopians, chap. xiv. 10 seq.—*And they executed judgment on Joash;* in other cases the preposition *beth* is employed in such a connection (*e.g.*, Ezek. v. 10, 15), here את is used (like עשה טובה את 1 Sam. xxiv. 19): to execute judgment *with*, or at a person. These words refer to the disease and pain, with which Joash was afflicted. He had probably been wounded in the battle.—V. 25. *And when they departed from him—for* (he did not perish in the fight, as he deserved, but) *they left him in great pain, his own servants conspired against him*, &c. Instead of *the sons of Jehoiada* we must read "the son of Jehoiada" according to the text. This reading is adopted in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate*. The Makkeph has been altered by mistake into *Yod*. *And slew him;* they murdered him as a just retribution for having murdered Zechariah (cf. v. 22). They slew the sick monarch *in his bed*, according to 2 Kings in the Millo house. *They buried him in the city of David, but did not bury him in the sepulchres of the Kings;* in Kings we read, "they buried him by his fathers in the city of David." The two accounts are not at variance with each other; he was buried in the city of David, where his fathers were also buried, but not in the sepulchres of the kings. The design of the historian is to point out the fact that the king, who had permitted the apostasy from Jehovah and was guilty of the murder of Zechariah, was not thought worthy of the honour of resting in the sepulchres of the kings.—The names of the conspirators were *Jozakar* and *Jehozabad* according to 2 Kings, the former is called the *son of Shimeath*, who is described in this passage as an Ammonitess, the other was the *son of Shomer*, or, as it is spelt in this passage, the *son of Shimrith the Moabitess*.—V. 27. The Keri וְרַבּוּ would have to be interpreted thus: and as regards his sons, may the utterance concerning him be increased, which might mean, may the wish expressed by the dying Zechariah (v. 22) be fulfilled in them in a still higher degree than in the case of his father. A later reader might look for some such meaning as this in the words, but it is evident that they are to be taken in a different sense. The *Syriac* and *Septuagint* (the latter read, instead of וַחֲמִשָּׁא, חמשה *five*) deviate very far from the Hebrew text, whereas the *Vulgate* follows it exactly. We render the passage thus: *and*

his sons and the multitude (Kethib וְרַב) *of the prophetic utterances with regard to him and the founding of the temple, behold they are written, &c. His sons* must have been celebrated for their deeds or their fate (cf. v. 3).—משא עליו has been referred by some to the tribute imposed upon him (2 Kings xii. 19); by others to the money which came in from the "collection (מַשְׂאַת) of Moses upon Israel," vv. 6 and 9 (but here we have עליו not על ישראל); by others again, according to 2 Kings ix. 25 and the fixed meaning of the word משא, to prophetic utterances. If there *were* such prophetic utterances in the work quoted here, this would explain the reference made by the historian in v. 19 to prophets in the time of Joash.

9. Chap. xxv.

AMAZIAH.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xiii. 1—6. (See the commentary on Kings).

Vv. 5—10. *Amaziah's preparations for war; he hires mercenary troops from the northern kingdom, but sends them away again in consequence of the warnings of a prophet.* These notices, which are not found in the Book of Kings, form the introduction to the accounts in vv. 11—13.—V. 5. *He arranged them (i.e.* the whole of Judah and Benjamin) *by fathers'-houses, according to the princes of the thousands and the princes of the hundreds.* The members of the different fathers'-houses were first formed into companies under the princes of the thousands and hundreds. The words "*all Judah and Benjamin,*" which are shown to be in the accusative by the preposition "*lamed,*" are put in apposition to the accusative suffix in ויעמידם (Angl. "and made *them*"). The number of warriors in the time of Jehoshaphat (chap. xvii. 14—19) was much larger; according to the passage before us Amaziah collected together 300,000 heavy armed soldiers. Over the same number of גבורי חיל, whom we may suppose to have been heavy armed in distinction from the archers, Adna held the command in the time of Jehoshaphat, and besides him four other leaders of large bodies of troops are named. The great

difference in the numbers may perhaps be explained from the fact, that in this passage it was not intended to give the total number of the troops. It must also be borne in mind, as earlier expositors have suggested, that since the days of Jehoshaphat the southern kingdom had been engaged in disastrous wars, and hence in Amaziah's time could not have been in a position to raise an equally numerous army.—V. 7. *With Israel;* to prevent misunderstanding the clause, "with *all the sons of Ephraim,*" is placed afterwards in apposition.—V. 8. The versions give only a general notion of the contents of this verse, so that we cannot tell whether the translators had our present Hebrew text before them or not. The text, as we now have it, is quite unintelligible, for (1) the antithetical clause which is introduced with the words כי אם can only mean: *but do thou come,* thou alone, and not the mercenary soldiers of the northern kingdom with thee; (2) the injunction חזק implies, that the king was to take courage and trust in God, and not in the hired troops; but, if the king yielded to the prophet's injunction, the prospect held out to him could not have been: God will bring thee into a snare, but, he will not lead thee into a snare. Hence we must adopt *Ewald's* suggestion and insert ולא in the text: *but do thou come alone, act, be strong* (show thyself strong) *with regard to the war, and God will not bring thee into a snare.* The arbitrary conjecture, that we are to supply: "but if thou wilt go to the war with the hired troops, God will bring thee into a snare," is not sufficient, for in that case we should have to complete the sense of the opening words of the verse by adding: and God will not bring thee into a snare.—V. 10. להגדיך, an accusative with *lamed,* in apposition to the suffix in ויבדילם (cf. v. 5); he separated them, *the troops, away* from his army. They went home full of wrath, and then afterwards invaded the southern kingdom (v. 13) destroying and plundering as they went.

Vv. 11, 12. *War with Edom* (cf. 2 Kings xiv. 7).—V. 11. "*Strengthened himself,* chap. xv. 8.—*The valley of salt;* to the south of the Dead Sea, cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 12.—The statement that ten thousand of the Edomitish prisoners were thrown down from the top of a rock is only found in the Chronicles; on the other hand the fact that Sela, the capital of Edom, was taken by the Jews at this time is only noticed in the Book of Kings.

In opposition to the conjecture, that the account contained in the Chronicles originated in the attempt to restore the illegible text of the Book of Kings *(Thenius)*, it is sufficient to say that the change would be very great indeed, as the words employed in the text of the Chronicles, if we except the word סלע, do not correspond to those of the passage in Kings, either in their sound or in the number of their letters. Should it be said, however, that the passage might have been taken, not from the text of our Books of Kings, but possibly from the same source as the account in Kings, though after the text had become illegible, the one conjecture would only rest upon the other, without gaining any force in consequence. The war with the hateful Edomites cannot have been carried on without cruelty, and there is no reason to doubt that the historian may have found in the sources he employed some more minute particulars of the events connected with the war. Of course we must not lay too much stress upon the round number *ten thousand.*

V. 13. *The soldiers of the northern kingdom invade the country.* After the relative clause, the narrative is carried forward in the imperfect with *vav conseq.*, the subject being placed first for the sake of emphasis; and *the men belonging to the company* (mentioned in v. 10) . . . *they invade*, &c., cf. Gen. xxii. 24. *The cities of Judah from Samaria to Beth-horon*, a singular description of the cities in the northern parts of the kingdom of Judah, which must be explained as meaning: *all the cities of Judah*, which stood in the line of march from Samaria to Beth-horon. Hence Samaria is mentioned as the starting-point of the invading army, not as the boundary line of the cities of Judah. On the site of Beth-horon, see 1 Chr. vii. 24. The attack upon the northern cities of Judah was probably made when Amaziah was absent with his army in Edom.

Vv. 14—16. *Amaziah introduces the Edomitish idolatry, and repulses with harsh words a prophet who blames him for doing so.* V. 15. cf. chap. xxxii. 13.—V. 16. The question, have we appointed thee a *counsellor* to the king, calls forth the appropriate reply: I know that God hath taken *counsel* to destroy thee, because thou hast done this (the worship of the Edomitish idols is referred to here) and hast not hearkened to my *counsel.*

Vv. 17—28. *Disastrous war with Joash, the king of the*

northern kingdom, and conclusion. Compare 2 Kings xiv. 8—20. (See the commentary on Kings, Vol. ii. p. 12—15).

10. CHAP. XXVI.

UZZIAH.

Vv. 1—4. (Compare 2 Kings xiv. 21—22, xv. 2, 3).—V. 1. *Uzziah* is the name always given to this king in the present chapter, and in the Books of the Prophets Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. In the Chronicles he is only once called Azariah, 1 Chr. iii. 12. In the second Book of Kings we find the name Uzziah in chap. xv. 13, 30, 32, 34, and Azariah in every other passage, *e.g.* chap. xiv. 21, xv. 1. It has been supposed that Azariah was his original name, and that the name Uzziah was either assumed when he ascended the throne (compare Jehoahaz and Ahaziah, 2 Chr. xxi. 17, and xxii. 1) or given to him by his soldiers after a prosperous war *(Thenius)*. But, as we find a descendant of Kohath, who is called both Uzziah and Azariah (1 Chr. vi. 9 and 21), and a descendant of Heman named Uzziel, and also Azarel (1 Chr. xxv. 4 and 18), it is more natural to suppose that the names were used interchangeably as having almost the same meaning.—It is expressly stated, that *the whole nation* took Uzziah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king, from which we are probably to infer, that there was a first-born son of Amaziah, whom they passed over when the choice was made.—V. 2. It is singular that the account of the fortification of the port of Eloth on the Red Sea, which Uzziah *restored* to the kingdom of Judah (chap. xxxiii. 13), is placed before the chronological notices in v. 3, not only here, but in the Book of Kings, where we regularly find the chronological accounts of the commencement and duration of the reigns of the different kings placed first. This position might have been chosen either on account of the importance attached to the conquest of Eloth, or from the desire of the historian to introduce Uzziah to his readers as the king, who was known to them as the conqueror of Eloth (הוּא בנה *he is* the king, *who built*). *Thenius* assumes, as an explanation, that the conquest of Eloth

occurred in the early part of his reign (this is certainly intimated in the clause "*after that the king slept with his fathers*"), and that it was associated with the murder of Amaziah and the choice of Uzziah as king. The possession of Eloth was of such importance to Uzziah, that he fortified the city. It could only be as a port that it was important, and hence it is probable that in his time voyages were made by Israelitish nerchants to the countries of the East, as in the time of Solomon.—V. 4. On the announcement that he did right according to the judgment of Jehovah, like his father Amaziah, see chap. xxv. 2. The estimate of Uzziah's character in v. 5 differs somewhat from that in 2 Kings, being restricted to the assertion that he sought Jehovah as long as Zechariah lived. By this limitation the historian explains the fact, that a king, who is described in vv. 16—21 as rashly encroaching upon the rights of the priests, was yet able to wage the most prosperous wars, and received the assistance of God in his undertakings. וידרוש לדרוש, the infinitive with *lamed* is here connected with the verb היה, to describe a continued action, in the same manner as the participle; cf. chap. xxxi. 21, (he did that which was right , . . seeking his God). When *Zechariah* is described as a prophet, in the words "*who understood the sight of God*" (cf. Dan. i. 17), we must understand the sight of God as denoting that intercourse with God, which was the condition of prophetic activity; still there is something striking in the expression he *understood the sight of God*, for the sight of God, which was granted to the prophets only in moments of the highest inspiration, cannot be regarded as the effect of human culture or activity. Moreover this expression is not used anywhere else as a description of a prophet. There arises therefore a suspicion as to the correctness of the reading. Some of the MSS. have a different reading, and that of the text is not adopted in the versions, or in the earlier writings of the Jews. The *Septuagint*, *Targum*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Talmud*, *R. Salomo*, *Jarchi*, *Kimchi*, and others, read המבין ביראת האלהים, *who was a teacher in the fear of God*. In some of the MSS. we find ביראות and ביראת, cf. *de Rossi* var. lect. The Zechariah mentioned here is not known to us any further; we may therefore conclude that he was a celebrated prophet, who stood to Uzziah in the relation of a counsellor and teacher.

Vv. 6—15. *Prosperous wars, buildings and warlike power of Uzziah.*—V. 6. *Jabneh*, which is here mentioned in connection with Gath and Ashdod as a city of the Philistines, was probably the same place as the Jabneel spoken of in Josh. xv. 11, as a city in the province of Judah; after the time of the Maccabees it is frequently mentioned under the name of Jamnia. *In Ashdod; i.e.*, in the district of Ashdod *and in the other districts of the Philistines.*—V. 7. The place called *Gur-baal* occurs nowhere else; it is rendered in the Septuagint ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, probably because the translators were thinking of Sela, the capital of the Edomites; according to the Targum it was the well known city of Gerar.—V. 8. Instead of "the Ammonites," the *Septuagint* has *οἱ Μινναῖοι*, but there is no reason to question the correctness of our reading, as there are other proofs that the power of Uzziah extended over the countries to the east of the Jordan, cf. v. 10. "*To the entering in*" (Judg. iii. 3); *his name reached as far as the boundary of Egypt;* this does not mean that his fame had spread as far as this, but that his kingdom touched the Egyptian frontier. The Hiphil הֶחֱזִיק is used here, as in Dan. xi. 7, 32, with the meaning to exercise power, to be victorious.—V. 9. *The corner gate*, (cf. chap. xxv. 23) probably at the north-west corner of the city; the *valley-gate*, on the western side, where the Joppa-gate now stands (cf. *Thenius*, die Stadt § 4). הַמִּקְצוֹעַ, *the springing corner*, must be looked for, according to Nehem. iii. 19, 20 and 24, 25, on the eastern side of Zion (see *Thenius* § 5), and refers to a curve in the city wall. The tower at this point commanded the horse-gate, and thus defended Zion and the temple-hill also against an attack from the south-east. וַיְחַזְּקֵם *and he put the towers in a state of defence*, v. 15, cf. chap. xi. 11.—V. 10. He built *towers in the desert*, in the district to the south-east of Jerusalem, on the west of the Dead Sea. The towers in this district, which was adapted for grazing, were intended to protect the cattle. *For he had many herds* in the desert just referred to (as the previous clause evidently implies), and *in the lowlands* between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean Sea (1 Chr. xxvii. 28), *and in the plain* on the other side of the Jordan in the province of Reuben (Deut. iv. 43; Josh. xx. 8; Jer. xlviii. 21). As the situation of *the plain* is not more minutely described, we can only suppose it to have

been the district on the east of the Jordan, which is called pre-eminently *the* plain. It is evident from Is. xvi. 1 that at this time the kings of the southern kingdom ruled over the countries to the east of the Jordan (cf. 1 Chr. v. 17). By the *Carmel*, as distinguished from the hills, on which the vineyards were, we must understand the local districts adapted for agriculture, cf. Is. xxix. 17; Jer. ii. 7 (cf. 1 Chr. xxvii. 25—31).—V. 11. לגדוד *in crowds*, in organised masses. The *numbering* was carried out by two officers who were skilled in writing and in the preparation of lists; these officers were placed under (על יד) Hananiah, who was one of the king's supreme officers.—V. 12. *The number of the heads of the fathers'-houses*, the number of the *military heroes was two thousand six hundred;* hence the army was divided into fathers'-houses, so that each father's house formed a distinct body. —The heads of the fathers'-houses are distinguished from the rest of the men as military heroes.—V. 13. בכח חיל, not *with the power of an army*, but *with mighty power*, the notion of power being greatly strengthened by the addition of the word *chail;* the same gradation is expressed in Zech. iv. 6 by the juxtaposition of the two words. *To help;* the verb with *lamed* is also met with in chap. xix. 2.—V. 14. *For them;* namely *for the whole army*. This is afterwards added to render it more emphatic. The whole army was thoroughly equipped. Shields, lances, helmets, and coats of mail were provided for the heavy armed troops, bows and stones for slings for the light armed. The *lamed* before אבני is a sign of the accusative, and is attached to the noun on account of its distance from the verb. The stones for slinging are certainly mentioned to show the completeness of the equipment, but the *lamed* does not mean *even to*, or *and even* the stones for slinging. —V. 15. חשבנות, with the dagesh in the שׁ, and therefore derived from a singular חִשָּׁבוֹן (חֶשְׁבּוֹן in Eccl. vii. 25, 27 has a different meaning), according to the explanatory clause the *cunning work of an artificer*, and according to the description given here *cleverly constructed machines for slinging.* The subject to the verb ויפלא is not God, as in Ps. xxxi. 22, but Uzziah, *he was helped in a marvellous manner so that he became strong.*

Vv. 16—21. *At the very moment, in which the king is about to usurp the priestly rights, notwithstanding the opposition of the priests, the leprosy shows itself in his forehead.* In 2 Kings xv. 5 it is

merely stated that God smote the king, and he was a leper till the day of his death. *Josephus* (Ant. 9. 10. 4) carries out the account still further, and states that the earthquake, which is mentioned in Amos i. 1 as occurring in the time of Uzziah, happened at the very moment when Uzziah resisted the priests, and also that the leprosy was caused by a ray of the sun which came through a crack in the roof of the temple and fell upon Uzziah's face.—V. 16. The word כחזקתו connects this account with the foregoing one, which closes with the same verb in v. 15. *His heart was so proud that he did wickedly*; cf. chap. xxvii. 2. He went into the large hall of the temple to offer a burnt-offering upon the golden altar, contrary to the law contained in Num. xviii. 1—7. *Thenius* is of opinion that Uzziah wanted to restore the high-priesthood exercised by David and Solomon; *Ewald* (Alterthümer p. 277) also expresses the same opinion. According to our view, which we have not room to defend, David and Solomon certainly took the lead in religious festivals on special occasions, but did not discharge those official duties, which, according to the precepts of the law, belonged to the priests alone (cf. Hitzig Psalmen ii. p. 175).—V. 17. *Azariah the priest* is expressly described in v. 20 as the high priest at that time; but in the list of high priests 1 Chr. v. 27—41 (in which Amariah, the contemporary of King Jehoshaphat is mentioned, so as to furnish a chronological starting-point) we find no Azariah who could have lived in the time of Uzziah. *Valiant men*; so called because they were courageous enough to oppose the king.—V. 18. *And it does not redound to thine honour before Jehovah Elohim*; לא, where we generally find אין, appears to have been chosen on account of the לא לך, which immediately precedes it before the infinitive with *lamed* (*thou durst not burn incense!*)—V. 19. Beside the altar of incense; the words "*from beside*" are used because we are to imagine the king and the priests standing before the altar.—V. 21. *In the infirmary* (Krankenhaus), see *Thenius* on 2 Kings xv. 5; compare the law in Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2. The reason assigned here, "*for he was shut out from the house of Jehovah*," is not given in 2 Kings; it must mean that, because he was declared unclean and durst not come into the temple, he was obliged to withdraw from intercourse with others, and to live in the infirmary. During the illness of the

king, Jotham was set over the king's house, *i.e.* he was prime minister, and in this capacity he judged the people of the land as ruler on behalf of the king.

Vv. 22, 23. *Conclusion;* compare 2 Kings xv. 6, 7. *The earlier and later;* chap. xxv. 26; 1 Chr. xxix. 29.—V. 23. Instead of "*in the city of David,*" which we find in 2 Kings, we have here the words, "*in the burial ground belonging to the kings, for they said, he is a leper;*" he was buried, therefore, near the sepulchre of the kings (*by his fathers*), as they durst not bury a king, who had died from leprosy, in the sepulchre itself for fear of polluting it.

11. Chap. xxvii.

JOTHAM.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xv. 32—35.—V. 1. *Jerushah,* his mother, was probably the daughter of the high priest Zadok mentioned in 1 Chr. v. 38.—V. 2. The exception, "*only he entered not into the temple of Jehovah,*" is wanting in 2 Kings, where there is also no notice of Uzziah's entering the temple; the further limitation, "*and the people still did wickedly,*" means the same as the passage in 2 Kings, "only the high places were not taken away," &c. The words, "*he built the upper gate of the house of Jehovah,*" are found in the brief extract in Kings, but the account of the other buildings we find only in the Chronicles. The *upper* gate of the temple is certainly the upper gate, which was situated towards the north (Ezek. ix. 2) and which, according to the representations in Ezek. viii., led into the upper or inner court. In Jer. xx. 2, it is called the upper gate of Benjamin, which is in the temple. It was called the *upper* gate, not to distinguish it from the other gates of the inner court, which were on the same level with it, but probably because it was situated towards the north, towards that part of the temple hill, which was the upper as compared with the southern portion. There is good reason to doubt, whether it was called the *upper* gate because it was the *chief,* as *Thenius* supposes, for we seek in vain for any adjective, which would express the antithesis to

עליון in this sense, and would be employed with reference to a gate or a building. *He built the gate;* these words are not to be understood as denoting the erection of a gate, which was not previously in existence, but the restoration and beautifying of an old gate. As it was situated towards the north, the holy quarter, and was the principal entrance, this may have led Jotham to think it necessary to embellish it with architectural ornaments. *And on the wall of the Aphel,* the southern slope of the temple-hill, *he built much,* feeling the same desire as his father (chap. xxvi. 9) to secure the city and the temple against attacks from the south and east. *In the wooded hills, i.e.* on the summits of the mountains of Judah, where fortified cities could not be built, he erected *castles* (chap. xvii. 12) and *towers.*

V. 5 seq. *Successful war with the Ammonites.*—V. 5. *They brought him* tribute *again both in the second and also in the third year.*—V. 6. *He fortified himself,* that is, according to v. 7, he secured his throne by other prosperous wars. *For he made his ways firm* (Prov. xxi. 29), he walked firmly and modestly *before Jehovah.*

Vv. 7—9. *Conclusion,* cf. 2 Kings xv. 36—38.—V. 8. The repetition of the chronological notices already given in v. 1 may possibly be explained on the assumption that the historian found them in one of the sources, which he employed, at the commencement of the history of Jotham, and in another at the end. In v. 37 of the Book of Kings, the position of which answers to that of the present verse, it is stated that in the time of Jotham the war between the allied kings, Rezin and Pekah, and the nation of Judah had already broken out.

12. Chap. xxviii.

AHAZ.

V. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xvi. 1—4. See the commentary on Kings, Vol. ii. 34—40.

Vv. 5—16. *War with Rezin, king of Aram, and Pekah, king of the northern kingdom;* cf. 2 Kings xvi. 5, and Is. vii. 1. The attempt to determine the relation in which the different accounts

stand to one another, has led to various results. Expositors are not agreed as to whether the description in the Book of Kings and that in Isaiah relate to the campaign, of which we have an account in the Chronicles. Of those who answer this question in the negative some are of opinion, that the account in Kings and Isaiah refers to the first campaign, and that in the Chronicles to the second; others, on the contrary, regard the latter as a description of the first campaign, and the former of the second. A very complete list of the representatives of the different opinions is given by *Caspari* in his work über den syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg p. 28, 29. His own opinion is that the Book of Kings and the passage in Isaiah treat of the same campaign as the Chronicles. The order of events he supposes to have been the following: the allied kings invade Judah (2 Kings xvi. 5 a); a great battle is fought between Pekah and Ahaz to the north of Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxviii. 5); Rezin fights with Ahaz in Idumæa (2 Chr. xxviii. 5 a; this result is said to be obtained from a comparison of 2 Chr. v. a and 2 Kings xvi. 6!); the Jews taken prisoners by the two kings, both during and after the engagements, and the plunder collected by them, are sent away to their capitals in charge of a division of the army (2 Chr. xxviii. 5, 8, 12); and with the remaining troops they make an ineffectual attempt to besiege Jerusalem (2 Kings xvi. 56). But if this were adopted as the order of events, we should have to assume that the following, to say the least, very complicated movements were made by the armies: first, that both armies advanced into Judah, then that a division took place and two battles were fought with divided forces, one to the north of Jerusalem, the other in Idumæa; and that after this the two armies reunited for the purpose of besieging Jerusalem. The following arrangement appears much more simple: it is probable that one or more battles were fought anterior to the siege of Jerusalem, and there is nothing to hinder us from assuming, that a reference is made to these battles in v. 5, and that Ahaz, who was defeated in them all, found it necessary to retreat to Jerusalem. When the royal conquerors approached Jerusalem to besiege it, Ahaz and his people looked forward to their approach with trembling, Is. vii. 2. But the allied kings were unable to take the city, and Rezin marched round the southern point of the Dead Sea into the land

of Edom, 2 Kings xvi. 6. (In 2 Kings xvi. 6 Rezin alone is named, but it does not follow from this, that Pekah had gone away from him with his army, since the historian might attribute to Rezin, as the leader of the enterprise, that which had really been effected by the joint exertions of Rezin and Pekah). It is true that if we may arrange the events in this order, the question is not therefore decided, whether they all occurred in the campaign of a single summer. As it is expressly stated in 2 Kings xv. 37, that the war with the allied kings broke out during Jotham's reign, it is a very natural conclusion that the whole war was not confined to one summer or one campaign. Even the elaborate researches of *Caspari* fail to prove, that all the notices *must* refer to the events of the same campaign.—V. 5. וידכו בו (cf. v. 17) they effected a defeat *in him, i.e.*, in his army; so also מֵעִמּוֹ *from him, i.e.*, from his army.—V. 6. So great a loss as the death of 120,000 soldiers in one day could not have befallen the inhabitants of the southern kingdom from any other cause, than *because they had forsaken Jehovah the God of their fathers*; this is clearly stated in chap. xv. 2.—V. 7. Among those who fell was a *king's son*, probably an elder member of the royal house, as the sons of Ahaz were still very young and can hardly have taken part in the battle; *a prince of the house*, that is, not a prince of the house of God, chap. xxxi. 13, 1 Chr. ix. 11, but a superior officer of the royal house; and *a prime minister* (cf. Esther x. 3. 1 Sam. xxiii. 17); they were all three slain by Zikri a hero of the northern kingdom.—V. 8. *Of their brethren*; this term is emphatically applied to the inhabitants of the southern kingdom both here and in v. 11; the soldiers of the northern kingdom did not scruple to take the wives, sons, and daughters of *their brethren* captive.—V. 9. The prophet Oded, concerning whom we have no further information, went to meet the army, which was returning with the prisoners and the booty, as Azariah ben Oded, chap. xv. 2, went to meet Asa. *On account of the anger of Jehovah—towards Judah, Jehovah hath given them into your hand*; ye have not gained the victory by your own power, and therefore ye ought to have shown yourselves gentle towards those with whom Jehovah was angry; *but ye have slain among them in a rage, which reaches to heaven*, i.e. not in a rage without bounds, but in a rage which God will

not suffer to go unpunished, cf. Ezra ix. 6. The words of this verse remind us of Is. x. 6 seq.—V. 10. The accusative, *and now the sons of Judah and Jerusalem*, is placed before the verb for the sake of emphasis; *these*, your brethren, from whom Jehovah has withdrawn his aid for a short time, "*ye think to enslave.*" In this spirited address the word אתם, which is placed first, points to the suffix in עמכם: *are there not, as regards you, yes among you, sins against Jehovah?*—V. 11. As the measure of their iniquity was filled by their taking the wives and others captive, so could the wrath of God, the fearful judgment which was suspended over them, only be averted by sending back the captives.—V. 12. The names of the four men are only mentioned here; according to v. 14 the princes at the head of the whole congregation *opposed* those who were coming from the army.—V. 13. אשמת יהוה, a crime which must excite the anger of Jehovah, see v. 10; *for in order that an offence of Jehovah* may come *upon us, ye think* (ye intend) *to add to our sins*, &c., *i.e.*; according to v. 10, to bring upon yourselves the further sin of making the captives your servants and maids.—V. 14. *The armed men; i.e.* those who were sent to bring the prisoners to Samaria. *The spoil*; chap. xiv. 13.—V. 15. By the *men, who were mentioned by name*, we need not understand the four men referred to just before (cf. chap. xxxi. 19; 1 Chr. xvi. 41). *From the plunder*; sc. which had been taken in Judah (v. 8). *They anointed them*, for they wished them to return home, not like the mourners mentioned in 2 Sam xiv. 2, but in a joyous procession. לכל כושל, an accusative of which *lamed* is the sign: *they conducted them upon asses*, not all of them; but only *every one who stumbled*, that is, who was weary. *Jericho the palm city* (see Judges iii. 16) was in the southern kingdom, and therefore when the prisoners reached this city they had come to *the side of their brethren.*—This account of the defeat of Ahaz and the release of the captive women and children rests, as the names show, upon precise historical reminiscences. The historian presents the occurrence in such a light, that the reader may see in it an example of the way in which, according to the will of God as made known by the prophet, the inhabitants of the northern kingdom were always bound to act; but that which happened in the time of Ahaz, was to occur again, as Is. xliii. 5, 6,

and lx. 3 sqq. and other similar passages show, on a much larger and more glorious scale at the time of the great redemption. We see at once from the words themselves with what pleasure the historian dwells upon this event. He describes it in his own way, and gives the substance of the addresses of Oded and the princes in his own words.—V. 16. The general expression "*at this time*" shows that the application for help was made during the war with Syria and Ephraim. *The kings;* in all the ancient versions have the singular. We regard the singular as the original reading. *Caspàri* (p. 44) supposes that the plural was intentionally chosen by our historian, who regarded the Assyrian kingdom or empire as represented or displayed in a concrete form by the line of Assyrian kings.

Vv. 17—21. *Judah invaded by the Edomites and Philistines; oppressed by the Assyrians.*—V. 17. The invasion of Judah can hardly have been attempted by the Edomites, till after Rezin had delivered them from the power of Judah, to which they had again been subjected since the days of Uzziah, (cf. 2 Kings xvi. 6 where, instead of *Aram* and the *Aramaeans*, we should read *Edom* and the *Edomites*).—V. 18. *Gimzo*, according to *Robinson* now called *Jimsu*, a large village on the road from Lydda to Beth-horon.—V. 19. Ahaz is called here *King of Israel*, not because he acted as if he had been a king of the northern kingdom rather than the king of Judah, nor yet from irony, because his reign was the bitterest satire upon the name of "King of Israel, the people of God" *(Caspari)*; but Israel is rather to be considered here, as in v. 27, chap. xii. 6, xxi. 2, &c., as a term applied, according to well-known usage, to that portion of the Israelitish people which dwelt in the southern kingdom. הפריע, used in Ex. v. 4 with the accusative of the object, here written with *beth* in the sense: "*he had acted in a licentious manner in Judah*," not, he had made the people of Judah licentious.—V. 20. ויבא עליו, as the following words show, can only denote a coming in a hostile sense. ולא חזקו must be explained from Jer. xx. 7, and 1 Kings xvi. 22, as meaning: *and did not overcome him;* if the usual interpretation, "*and strengthened him not*," or, "*did not assist him*," were correct, the verb *chazak* would be construed here with the accusative in a sense which it cannot be shown to bear anywhere else.—V. 21. חלק according to the

earlier expositors *to divide*, with the meaning: he took one part from the temple and another from the king's house; but the expression "*he divided the temple*," could not be paraphrased in such a way as this. We agree with *Gesenius* and others, who regard the word as meaning *to plunder*, though this is the only passage in which it is so employed; compare the substantive חֵלֶק. There are other similar passages, in which the temple and the king's house are spoken of (*e.g.* chap. xii. 9, xvi. 2, and 1 Kings xvi. 8); in the passage before us the latter is called *the house of the king and the princes*, probably because the intention of the writer was to show, that Ahaz seized upon the valuables belonging to the superior officers and others, who lived in the king's palace, and gave them up to the king of Assyria. But in what relation does the account here given stand to that contained in the Second Book of Kings? According to the Book of Kings the circumstances were as follows:—Ahaz solicited help from king Tiglath-Pileser, sent him silver and gold, and Tiglath-Pileser assisted him by going to war with the king of Damascus. According to the accounts in the Chronicles Ahaz applied to the king of Assyria for help in the time of the Syrio-Ephraimitish war (v. 16), but the latter marched against Ahaz himself, pressed him sore, but did not overcome him, for though Ahaz had sent treasures to Tilgath-Pilneser, this did him no good, *i.e.* in spite of the treasures Tilgath-Pilneser attacked him (v. 20 seq.) The difference between the two accounts is this: according to both of them Ahaz applied to Tiglath-Pileser for help at the time of his war with the Syrians and the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, and also according to both he sent treasures to Tiglath-Pileser. But in 2 Kings the application is said to have been successful. Tiglath-Pileser actually rendered assistance by the conquest of Damascus; in the Chronicles, however, this is passed over in silence. This, in itself, is not at all surprising; but when it is further stated in the Chronicles, that "Tilgath-Pilneser attacked Ahaz, and, though the latter had sent him treasures, no help was afforded him," we have here a different fact communicated from that referred to in the Book of Kings. We may safely affirm, then, that the statement contained in this verse, to the effect that the sending of the treasures did no good to Ahaz, is made with the whole result in view; and

that the account in Kings may be brought into harmony with it in the following manner: though assistance was rendered to Ahaz for the moment by the conquest of Damascus, the negotiations with Tilgath-Pilneser secured him no real help, but brought upon him eventually calamity and disgrace. We cannot dismiss the definite statement contained in this verse, that the calamity consisted in the fact that Tilgath-Pilneser attacked Ahaz and sorely pressed him, with a simple reference to the rhetorical character of our narrative as *Caspari* (p. 70) does, when he says "the words are not to be taken in a strictly historical sense, but as rhetorical in their character; they contain a bitter irony; if the author had intended to say that Tilgath-Pilneser made a regular attack upon Ahaz, he would most likely have chosen a different expression." It is conceivable, that, after the king of Assyria had rendered the first assistance to Ahaz by the conquest of Damascus, he was induced to turn against him and attack him, and that he sent an army, possibly only a flying company of marauders into the southern kingdom, for the purpose of extorting tribute. It is true, there is no mention of this in the Book of Kings (for there is no ground for the opinion, which some have expressed, that there is a reference in 2 Kings xvi. 18 to the outbreak of hostilities between Tiglath-Pileser and Ahaz), but it does not necessarily follow that the account in the Chronicles is an arbitrary invention, for the author is just as likely to have taken the account of the attack made by Tiglath-Pileser upon the southern kingdom from a source with which we are unacquainted, as that of the invasion of the Philistines (the historical character of which is attested by Is. xiv. 28 sqq. and 2 Kings xviii. 8), or of the Edomites.

Vv. 22, 23. *Introduction of Syrian deities.* Compare 2 Kings xvi. 10—16, where Ahaz is said to have caused a new altar to be made in the place of the old brazen altar of burnt-offering, after the pattern of an altar, which he had seen in Damascus.— V. 22. כְּעִתּוֹ צָר, *at the time when he was distressed, i.e.* when *Tilgath-Pilneser* was oppressing him. *He, King Ahaz;* who distinguished himself above every other king by the wickedness he displayed. V. 23. *Who had smitten him;* not only according to the opinion of Ahaz (so as to mean *as if they had smitten him*), but the historian himself describes them as the most dangerous

enemies that Ahaz had. *All Israel*; the judgments which the Assyrians were commissioned by God to inflict upon Judah are regarded by the historian as peculiarly the effect of the idolatry of Ahaz.

Vv. 24, 25. *Destruction of the sacred vessels and spread of idolatrous worship.* Compare 2 Kings xvi. 17, 18, where we read that, on account of the king of Assyria, that is in order to procure his assistance, Ahaz took away the valuable works of art from the temple. In the passage before us the rest of the narrative is omitted, and these circumstances serve as the groundwork of a description of the hatred which Ahaz displayed to the temple of Jehovah and his preference for the rites of the heathen. —V. 24. *Ahaz collected together the vessels of the temple and broke them to pieces*, he gathered them together that he might destroy the whole of them at once; וַיְקַצֵּץ occurs in the Second Book of Kings also, where it is used with the meaning "*to break off*," as the context shows. But here it refers to the vessels, which were already collected together, gathered in a heap, and therefore must have the more general signification: *to break in pieces*. *He shut the doors of the house of Jehovah*; in order, as we gather from chap. xxix. 3, 7, to put an end, by forcible means, to the worship of Jehovah in the temple, inasmuch as Ahaz *had erected altars* for heathen worship *in every corner of Jerusalem*, and therefore the temple worship was superfluous.

II. CHAP. XXIX.—XXXII.

HEZEKIAH.

Chap. xxix. 1, 2. Compare 2 Kings xviii. 1—3.—V. 1. *Abijah*; in 2 Kings we find the very abbreviated form *Abi*, which most likely differed from the other, not merely in the spelling (as *Thenius* supposes), but in the pronunciation also.

Vv. 3—36. *Purification and dedication of the temple.* Compare the short account in 2 Kings xviii. 5 seq.—Vv. 3—17. *In the first sixteen days of the first new year, after Hezekiah ascended the throne, the priests and the Levites purified the temple.*—V. 3. It is evident from v. 17 compared with chap. xxx. 2, 3, that by *the*

first month we are to understand the month prescribed in the law for the offering of the paschal sacrifice; it must therefore have been Nisan, the first month of the sacred year. It is not said that this first month was the month in which Hezekiah began to reign, all that is stated is that in the first year of Hezekiah's reign, the commencement of which year must be reckoned from the first of Tisri, and on the first day of the sacred year, the temple was opened. *He opened the gates;* see chap. xxviii. 24. *And he strengthened them;* according to 2 Kings xviii. 16, Hezekiah had provided for the beautifying of the doors, and to this the indefinite expression, "*he strengthened them*," will refer, as this expression could be used with reference to a new building, or the restoration of an old one.—V. 4. *The eastern open space* before the temple was the inner court; see Ezra x. 9.—V. 5. *Sanctify yourselves* (v. 15, chap. xxx. 15); that ye may set about the work of sanctifying the temple in a state of levitical purity.—Vv. 6, 7. *Our fathers;* this must mean Ahaz and his contemporaries, since the charge of entire apostasy from Jehovah, contained in these very general words, could only apply to the generation immediately preceding Hezekiah. *And they turned the back;* not literally so by looking towards the rising sun, like the twenty-five in Ezek. viii. 16, and turning their backs upon the temple and God, who was enthroned upon the ark, but in this sense: they despised the dwelling-place of Jehovah.—V. 7. *The doors of the porch* are the doors of the house of Jehovah (chap. xxviii. 24), which led from the open space in the porch to the larger space in the temple. When they were shut, the *lamps* in the larger room could not be lighted, and the *incense* could not be burned upon the golden altar. The words, "*the burnt sacrifices also have not been offered*," are probably based upon the account in 2 Kings xvi. 14.—V. 8. On the first clause of the verse, see chap. xxiv. 18, xxxii. 25. *As ye see with your own eyes;* this refers to the calamities, which befel the people under Ahaz: viz., the wars with the Syrians, Ephraimites, Philistines, and Edomites, and the oppression on the part of the Assyrians; cf. chap. xxx. 7; Neh. ii. 17.—V. 9. cf. chap. xxviii. 6, 8.—V. 10. *Now I have it in my mind;* see 1 Chr. xxii. 7. The concluding clause occurs again in chap. xxx. 8.—V. 11. *My sons;* the king applies this term to the priests and Levites in his hearty appeal. The

Niphal תשלו only occurs here, see Deut. x. 8.—Vv. 12, 13. Two Levites are named belonging to each of the three great Levitical families Gershon, Kohath, and Merari; two from the family of Elizaphan, who is mentioned in Ex. vi. 18, under the name of Elzaphan (the son of Uzziel, the son of Kohath), and in the time of Moses was the prince of the family of Kohath, Num. iii. 30; then two each from the descendants of Asaph (the family of Gershon), of Heman (the family of Kohath), and of Jeduthun (the family of Merari, cf. 1 Chr. vi. 29—32); in all fourteen. Of the names given here, Machath, Eden ben Joach and Jechuel or Jechiel (chap. xxxi. 13—15) occur again. Some of the names, *e.g.* Kish ben Abdi, Joach ben Zimma, have already been given in the genealogical list in 1 Chr. vi., and appear to have been the names of Levitical families, by which the head of the family may always have been known.—V. 15. The fourteen chiefs *gathered their brethren*, at whose head they stood. *At the command of God* (chap. xxx. 12, cf. 1 Chr. xxv. 5); in the manner prescribed by the law.—V. 16. They went *within into the house of Jehovah* or into the היכל יהוה; *i.e.* they went into the holy place, and possibly into the holiest of all; compare Ezek xli. 3, where לפנימה occurs with the meaning within, into the holiest of all. The priests alone were permitted by the law to go into the actual temple. In this case, whatever they found there, that was unclean (we must assume, notwithstanding the account in chap. xxviii. 24, that the historian was thinking here of the pollution of the inner part of the temple by the idolatry of Ahaz, cf. v. 18), they brought into the outer court, where the Levites took it from them to carry it beyond the boundary of the sanctuary. *Into the brook Kidron*, chap. xxx. 14; 2 Kings xxiii. 12.—V. 17. On the first day they commenced with the sanctification or purification of the courts, this was finished on the eighth day, and then they came *to the porch of Jehovah*, *i.e.* they were able to enter upon the work of purifying the actual building, which required eight days.—V. 18—30. *Consecration of the temple by the offering of burnt sacrifices*, cf. Ezra vi. 17, viii. 35.—V. 18. *Within*; into the king's palace. Here only *one* table of show bread is mentioned, cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 16.—V. 19. *Which Ahaz had cast away* (see 1 Chr. xxviii. 9) *during his reign*; by perverting them from their sacred use (it is expressly

stated in 2 Kings xvi. 14, that he removed the brazen altar out of its place). Hence in chap. xxviii. 24, the historian must have referred to other articles. Here he is speaking simply of those which had fallen into disuse. The *altar of Jehovah* is the altar of burnt-offering, cf. v. 21.—Vv. 20, 21. Early the next day Hezekiah went to the temple with the princes of the city (his wish to proceed with the expiation immediately after the purification prevented him from assembling the representatives of the whole community). The bullocks, rams, and lambs were to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings, the goats as sin-offerings; together they formed the sacrifices of purification and consecration.—V. 23. The imposition of hands, which took place in the case of burnt-offerings and thank-offerings also (Lev. i. 4, iii. 2), is here particularly noticed in connection with the sin-offerings, probably because confession of sin accompanied the imposition of the hands (cf. Lev. xvi. 21), which gave to this symbolical action peculiar importance in the case of the sin-offerings.—V. 24. וירחצאו, not וזרקו as in v. 22, for the blood of the sin-offerings they brought as an atonement to the altar, the priests sprinkling the horns of the altar with a portion of the blood and then pouring the rest of the blood on the floor of the altar (Lev. iv. 30—34). *For all Israel, i.e.*, for all the Israelites in the southern and northern kingdom, *the king had commanded the burnt-offering, &c.*, for Hezekiah regarded the temple as the sanctuary of all the Israelites, and at a later period invited the northern tribes also to take part in the passover, chap. xxx. 1.—V. 25. Comp. 1 Chr. xv. 16. *The king's seer;* cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 9.—*According to the commandment of David, &c.* (and at the same time in obedience to a command of God) *for the command was through Jehovah* (or as it is afterwards added by way of explanation), *through his prophets;* it does not follow from this that David is represented as one of the prophets, for as a *man of God* (2 Chr. viii. 14) he was able to issue injunctions on behalf of God.—V. 26. *With the instruments of David;* see 1 Chr. xxiii. 5.—V. 27. *At the time when the burnt-offering began* (Num. xvii. 11), *the song of Jehovah* (1 Chr. xvi. 42, xxv. 7) *and the trumpets also began, and that according to the lead of* (or *together with*) *the instruments of David.* In the *Septuagint* the *Vav* is not expressed before על ידי; in the *Vulgate* and *Syriac* the passage is rendered very freely. The text would be less obscure if either the *Vav* or על

יְדֵי was omitted, but we have no right to make any alteration. —V. 28. The word *song* is used here for all the singers; see *Hitzig* on Ezek. xxxiii. 32. *The trumpeters*; see 1 Chr. xv. 24.—V. 29. לְהַעֲלוֹת, here used without the accusative of the object, which may be omitted, as it is evident from v. 27 that it is to burnt-offerings that the passage refers.—V. 30. *The seer*; this title is applied to Asaph here, to Heman in 1 Chr. xxv. 5, and to Jeduthun in 2 Chr. xxxv. 15.—Vv. 31—36. In the newly consecrated temple numerous *thank-offerings, praise-offerings, and free-will burnt-offerings were presented at the request of the king.* V. 31. The king addresses the priests, who were newly consecrated by the sacrifice of the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, and who were therefore fitted to resume the duties of their office in connection with the offering of sacrifice (cf. Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 1 sqq.). The *thodoth* were also thank-offerings, but of a peculiar description; on the occasion of their presentation songs of praise were sung, probably according to some fixed plan (cf. Nehem. xii. 31—40; Lev. vii. 11—15, xxii. 29 seq.). *The assembly*; not assembled priests, but chiefly the princes (v. 20), and the rest of those who took part in the meeting.—V. 34. Compare chap. xxx. 3, 15, 24. The removal of the skin of the burnt-offering was to be the work, according to Lev. i. 6, of him who offered the sacrifice; but here the priests are referred to as having this work to do, and they were assisted on the present occasion by the Levites, simply because a sufficient number of them had not yet sanctified themselves. *Till the work was ended*; that is till the animals were flayed and the priests had sanctified themselves; cf. chap. xxxv. 11. *For the Levites had been more honourable with reference to their own sanctification than the priests*, they had shown greater alacrity than the priests, who may perhaps have had a greater share in the introduction of the idolatrous practices of Ahaz, and may, therefore, have been more reluctant to comply with the wishes of Hezekiah.—V. 35. Another thing which prevented the priests from finishing the flaying by themselves was that the actual service of the altar made too great a demand upon their time, for *there were burnt-offerings in abundance with the fat of the thank-offerings* (which might be regarded as a part of the burnt-offerings, seeing that it had to be burned by the priests upon the burnt-offerings, Lev. iii. 5, vi. 5), *and with the*

drink-offerings, which belonged to the burnt-offerings (Num. xv. 1—16). On the last clause of the verse see chap. viii. 16, xxxv. 10. *By the service of the house of Jehovah* we must understand the act of purification and consecration.—V. 36. The article before הכין takes the place of the relative, see 1 Chr. xxvi. 28: *that God had prepared the people, for the thing was done suddenly*, and yet the people took such interest in it! Cf. chap. xxx. 12.

Chap. xxx. *Celebration of the passover.*—V. 1—12. The king invites all the Israelites to take part in the festival.—V. 1. *To all Israel, and* (as the writer adds to prevent misunderstanding, cf. chap. xxv. 7) *also to Ephraim and Manasseh*, the two leading tribes of the northern kingdoms, which are mentioned by name not as single tribes, but to denote the entire body of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom (cf. v. 10), *he wrote letters.*—V. 2. *In the second month*; as it was lawful for individuals to celebrate the so-called minor passover on the 14th of the second month, if they were prevented from keeping it in the first month (Num. ix. 6—13), the celebration of the passover on this occasion was postponed till the 14th of the second month (v. 13) after the king, the princes, and the whole assembly had held a joint consultation, for (v. 3) *at that time* (this indefinite expression refers to the period mentioned in chap. xxix. 3, so that we may substitute "in the first month") they could not keep it, (1) because the priests had not sanctified themselves in sufficient numbers (לְמַדַּי is composed of לְ, מַה and דַּי, *to that which was enough*, see 1 Chr. xv. 13), (2) because the people had not assembled. This seems to imply that, although the purification of the temple was not completed till the sixteenth day of the first month (chap. xxix. 17), the passover would have been kept in the first month, though possibly not on the legal fourteenth day, if it had not been necessary to postpone it for the reasons given here.—V. 5. ויעמידו דבר, correctly rendered in the *Vulgate et decreverunt*, see Neh. x. 33. *To issue a proclamation*, cf. chap. xxxvi. 22. *For they had not kept it in a body, as it is written*; these words are sometimes supposed to mean: they had not kept it *for a long time* according to the precepts of the law (thus explained by early Jewish expositors, and among those of modern times by *De Wette*). But it may be objected to this explanation that

לרב is not used by itself to denote a number of days or of years. In our view it relates to the crowd of participators: all Israel was summoned, for they had not kept it *en masse*, in the assembly of the whole people, as the law required, cf. vv. 13, 24. Nothing is said respecting the length of time during which it had not been celebrated by them *as a body*, see on the other hand v. 26; 2 Kings xxiii. 22.—V. 6. *The runners* (v. 10), like those mentioned in Esther iii. 13, 15, viii. 14, are royal messengers; the soldiers of the king's body-guard (chap. xii. 10, 11) were employed in this capacity, as we learn from chap. xxiii. 1 sqq. *They went away with letters—and according to the king's command to say*; they were to add a verbal exhortation to the written invitation. *And he may return to the remnant which is left to you from the hand of the kings of Assyria*; according to this, certain *kings of Assyria* had carried some of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom into exile as early as the time of Hezekiah. There were none carried away in the time of Phul (2 Kings xv. 19); in the time of Tiglath-Pileser, however, there may have been (1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Kings xv. 29). The expedition of Shalmanezer, which occurred in the sixth year of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 9—12, cannot be intended here, if a strict chronological arrangement is to be preserved.—V. 7. On the last clause see chap. xxix. 8.—V. 8. *Be not stiff-necked* (cf. 2 Kings xvii. 14; Neh. ix. 16, 17). *Give the hand*, see 1 Chr. xxix. 24.—V. 9. *Your brethren and sons*, who are living in exile, will be *an object of compassion* (this expression also occurs in Neh. i. 11) *to those who led them away and for a return to this land.*—V. 10. *They laughed them to scorn*, the Hiphil only occurs in this passage.—V. 11. *Humbled themselves*; see chap. xii. 7.—V. 12. *In Judah was the hand of God that he gave them, &c.*; cf. chap. xxix. 36. *By the word of Jehovah*, chap. xxix. 15.—Vv. 13—22. *The festival.*—Vv. 13, 14. The Israelites, who were assembled to sacrifice the passover and to keep the Mazzoth-festival connected with it, removed the altars (of burnt-offering) and the altars of incense erected by Ahaz (chap. xxviii. 24), that they might purify and sanctify Jerusalem the city of the festivals before the passover was offered, and threw them into the brook Kedron (chap. xxix. 16). The *mikteroth* (altars for incense), the altars upon which the *ketoreth* was offered are only mentioned here by this name;

they had their place in the idolatrous worship by the side of the altars of burnt-offering as well as in the Israelitish ceremonial. —V. 15. נִבְלָמוּ; according to chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3, this means *they were ashamed*, and were driven by the feeling of shame to make haste and sanctify themselves for this festival. Although the Levites are also mentioned here, notwithstanding the fact that they are said to have been ready before this to sanctify themselves (chap. xxix. 34), the passage refers especially to the negligent priests.—V. 16. *In their place* (chap. xxxv. 10) *according to the order prescribed* (see 1 Chr. vi. 17); עֲמָדָם in this sense only in the Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Daniel. *They sprinkled the blood* of the paschal lambs *from the hand of the Levites*; the latter handed it to them, but they only did this as an exception on the present occasion, for—(v. 17) since many in the assembly had not sanctified themselves, the Levites presided over the slaying of the paschal lambs *for every* one that was *unclean, to sanctify the lambs to Jehovah* (chap. ii. 3), whereas at other times the heads of the families slew the lambs, and the priests received the blood from them, as the passage before us shows, and sprinkled it on the altar. In 2 Chr. xxxv. 6 the Levites are said to have superintended the slaying of the paschal lambs in the same manner as on this occasion, without any special reason being assigned; cf. Ezra vi. 20.—Vv. 18, 19. Of the three tribes named in v. 11 only two are noticed here, besides Ephraim and Issachar, viz., Manasseh and Zebulon. For such of them as had not purified themselves (וְהַמִּדְרִי the form in pause, in which the Kametz under the *tet* is changed into Seghol in consequence of the new Kametz which is introduced, see Ezra vi. 20) the Levites took charge of the slaying of the paschal lamb, for they also *ate the passover, otherwise than it was written* (another exceptional feature and one opposed to the law, Num. ix. 6, cf. *Josephus* b. j. 6. 9. 3) but this exception was allowed, *because Hezekiah had prayed for them in these words: may Jehovah the good* (that is, the kind and merciful) *forgive every one who has set his heart* (see chap. xii. 14) *to seek the God Jehovah the God of his fathers though not according to the purity of the sanctuary* (וְלֹא introduces a conditional clause, if it be not according to the purity of the sanctuary, even if he have not purified himself according to the law). We follow the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and the *Syriac*,

which contains a somewhat freer translation, and connect בְּעֵד at the end of v. 18 directly with v. 19; it stands here before a relative clause without אֲשֶׁר, like אֵל in 1 Chr. xv. 12 (see the note on this passage). Moreover the freedom of mind displayed here is worthy of regard; in order that the principal end might be attained, viz., the participation of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom in this festival, no stress was laid upon a form prescribed by the law.—V. 20. *And God healed the people;* we must imagine the whole affair to have been the following: in consequence of their transgressions they had cause to fear disease and even death (Lev. xv. 31); Hezekiah prayed for the nation, which was on the point of being diseased, and might therefore be regarded as sick already, as Abraham had once prayed for Abimelech when sick (Gen. xx. 7, 17), and restoration immediately ensued. No doubt, רָפָא means to pardon in this as in other similar passages, but only in the sense of averting the punishment of transgressions, cf. Jer. iii. 22; 2 Chr. vii. 14.—V. 21. On every one of the seven days the Levites and priests praised Jehovah with the instruments of the "*praise to Jehovah*," *i.e.*, in the usual manner and with the instruments which they generally employed in their songs of praise.—V. 22. דִּבֶּר עַל *he spake encouraging words of praise to the Levites, who showed good knowledge with reference to Jehovah, i.e.*, who distinguished themselves by their playing and their acquaintance with sacred music. *And they ate;* not the priests and Levites only, but the whole assembly ate, for many thank-offerings were sacrificed, the flesh of which was for the most part eaten by those who sacrificed, and such as were invited to participate in the sacrificial meals. הַמּוֹעֵד *the festival*, here with the meaning the festal sacrifice; cf. *chag*, Ex. xxiii. 18; Ps. cxviii. 27. וּמִתְוַדִּים, not *making confession of guilt* (for the reference in these verses is merely to the utterance of joy), *but approaching Jehovah with offerings of praise*, presenting *thodoth* (chap. xxix. 31) as well as the thank-offerings.—Vv. 23—27. *When Hezekiah and the princes presented the assembled congregation with rich gifts for farther sacrificial meals, it was decided that they should remain together for the next seven days, that they might celebrate a further festival, as a supplement to the joyous feast already kept.* Compare the fourteen days' festival described in chap. vii. 8 seq.; though on

that occasion the seven regular feast days were the last of the fourteen.—V. 23. Instead of שמחה many MSS. read בשמחה, as for example in 1 Chr. xxix. 22; but the former reading without the *beth* must be retained, for a dependent accusative is by no means rare in such a construction: they passed seven days *in gladness*.—V. 24. הרים, to *present* on condition that the animals should be offered in sacrifice (as a תרומה Ex. xxxv. 24; Num. xv. 19 sqq.); cf. chap. xxxv. 7 sqq. The last words, *and all the priests had sanctified themselves in a body*, refer back to chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3; there was therefore no longer any reason to fear that the strength of the priests would be insufficient to offer so extraordinary a number of sacrifices.—V. 25. Those who took part in the festival were, first, the whole assembly of Judah, and the priests and Levites; secondly, all who had come from the northern kingdom; thirdly, the strangers (proselytes), both those who had come from the northern kingdom and those who dwelt in Judah.—V. 26. כזאת, there had been nothing *of this kind* in Jerusalem; the meaning is, that the festival at the dedication of the temple in the time of Solomon was the only one that could be compared with this either as to the time of its duration, the sacrifices offered, the number of participants, or the joy with which it was attended.—V. 27. In some MSS. there is a *vav* conjunctive before הלוים, which has been adopted in the *Vulgate*, *Septuagint* (Alex.), and *Syriac* versions. It does not follow, however, that it originally formed part of the text, for it may have been inserted in these versions for the sake of clearness. As the two words stand side by side ἀσυνδέτως on other occasions, we are not warranted in putting the *vav* into the text; compare *Hitzig* on Jeremiah xxxiii. 18, and in addition to the passages cited there, 2 Chr. xxiii. 18.—According to the account contained in chaps. xxix. and xxx. the improvement of the worship by the purification of the temple and its fresh consecration was entered upon at the very beginning of Hezekiah's reign, because the pious king was desirous of celebrating the first passover and the feast of unleavened bread connected with it in the newly consecrated temple. The purification, however, occupied so long a time, that the passover could not be kept on the day prescribed in the law; it was therefore necessary to postpone it till the following month, when it was celebrated in a large as-

sembly, the inhabitants of the northern kingdom taking part. It is *a priori* a probable thing, that Hezekiah set about the purification of the temple at the commencement of his reign, and nowhere, either in the Book of Kings or in that of Isaiah, do we find any statements at variance with the account given here, that it was undertaken in the first year of his reign. At the same time our historian must have found in his sources more precise details with regard both to the feast of dedication which was celebrated after the purification of the temple (chap. xxix. 20—36), and also to the feast of passover and of unleavened bread (chap. xxx.). This is apparent not only from the names mentioned in chap. xxix. 12—14, but still more evidently from the account of the postponement of the feasts of passover and unleavened bread till the second month, from the reference to the priests who delayed to purify themselves (chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3, 24), and also from the statement that of those who took part in the feast, some who had come from the northern kingdom ate the passover without having purified themselves according to the law, and that the Levites undertook the slaying of their paschal lambs (chap. xxx. 17, 18). With regard especially to the celebration of the passover in the time of Hezekiah it is not very strange that it should be passed over in silence in the Book of Kings, for that book refers but very briefly in any case to the improvement of worship; but if it be indisputable that Hezekiah abolished the worship of idols (see especially 2 Kings xviii. 22), it must be assumed that the great spring-festival, the passover and unleavened bread, was celebrated in his time in a different way, that is, in a manner more in accordance with the law of Moses than it had been before; we say: *more so than before*, because we think it probable that even during the prevalence of idolatry there were certain festivals observed at the same times as those appointed in the law for the celebration of the great Jewish festivals. The account given in 2 Kings xxiii. 23 has been appealed to as altogether at variance with the statement in the Chronicles respecting the feast of the passover in the time of Hezekiah, and it has been said that apparently the narrative in Kings, which refers to the time of Josiah, has been applied in a somewhat altered shape to that of Hezekiah! In our opinion there is no discrepancy between the account in the Chronicles and that in the Book of

Kings, for 2 Kings xxiii. 22 evidently stands in the closest connexion with the preceding verse, and is to be interpreted thus: such a passover, as that kept in the time of Josiah, *i.e.* one conducted in all respects so completely in accordance with the precepts of the book of the covenant, had not been celebrated since the time of the Judges. According to the account before us the passover was celebrated in the time of Hezekiah with greater joy and on a larger scale, than any that had been held since the days of Solomon, but still, as it is expressly stated, neither at the legal time nor in a strictly legal way. We are warranted therefore in maintaining the historical basis of the present narrative, still we do not overlook the mode of treatment adopted by the historian, and the freedom with which he has worked up the historical material, especially in the section chap. xxx. 5—11, where the passages are very numerous in which we can detect the style and particular expressions, which are peculiar to the Chronicles. We read there, that the messengers of Hezekiah and his princes were sent to the inhabitants of *the whole* northern kingdom, who had been visited by grievous calamities, and that they called upon the remnant, which had been spared by the kings of Assyria, to turn to Jehovah; but the greater number laughed at this summons, and very few, principally members of the tribes inhabiting the most northerly districts, paid any regard to it at all. Is *Thenius* correct in saying, that, when the historian wrote that the special reason for the celebration of the passover was the calamity which had befallen Israel in consequence of the captivity (chap. xxx. 6 sqq.), he was carried away by his zeal, and forgot or did not wish to remember that the captivity had not taken place so early as the *first* year of Hezekiah? On the contrary, we believe that he did think of this, and wished to think of it. His intention was to represent the majority of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, and especially those dwelling on Mount Ephraim, and in the city of Samaria as men, who refused to be warned by the calamity which had befallen them from the hand of the Assyrians, and which was even then before their eyes, namely the invasion of Pul, and the captivity into which the fathers and brethren had been carried by Tiglath Pileser (the inhabitants would therefore be called in the strictest sense a remnant saved from the hand of the Assyrian kings, chap.

xxx. 6). He also meant to show that they ridiculed the last earnest appeal of Hezekiah, and *therefore* brought upon themselves by their own crimes the greatest calamity of all, the conquest of Samaria, the destruction of the northern kingdom, and the captivity of the time of Shalmaneser. The first year of Hezekiah was the third year of Hosea, the last king of the northern kingdom. He is said in 2 Kings xvii. 2 to have been a better king than his predecessors, and therefore we may safely assume that he did not oppose the wish of Hezekiah, that all Israel should assemble in Jerusalem to keep the passover.

Chap. xxxi. 1. *Destruction of the bamoth and idolatrous altars in both the southern and northern kingdoms.* Cf. 2 Kings xviii. 4. Even before the celebration of the passover the idolatrous altars in Jerusalem had been destroyed (chap. xxx. 14); immediately after the festival all who had taken part in it set out to cleanse the whole land of the altars and images *(from all Judah and Benjamin, i.e.* from the southern kingdom; *in Ephraim and Manasseh,* that is in the northern kingdom). It was not till this had been accomplished that every one went to his own home. The purification was completely effected, because, as we may assume the historian to mean, the force of those who went forth inspired by the festival was such as to frustrate all the attempts of the contemptuous Israelites (chap. xxx. 10), whether King Hosea or any one else, to preserve idolatry.

Vv. 2—11. *Arrangements for properly conducting the worship of God, and for the maintenance of the priests and Levites.* —V. 2. *To every one, according to his service, of the priests and the Levites;* the dependence of ללוים ולכהנים upon the word איש, which stands at some distance off, is shown by the preposition *lamed. In the gates of the tents of Jehovah;* see 1 Chr. ix. 18, 19.—V. 3. *The king's contribution from his possession* (we may see from chap. xxxii. 27—29 of what the possession consisted) *was for the burnt-offerings,* and indeed for all the burnt-offerings, which had to be offered according to the words of the law of Moses, Num. xxviii. 3, 4, 9, 11, 19, sqq. In והעלות the ל must be supplied from לעלות; as העלות has the article, לשבתות is made dependent by *lamed: and for the burnt-offerings of the Sabbaths, &c.*—V. 4. *He commanded the people, namely the inhabitants of Jerusalem* (the passage must be rendered thus,

not *the people and the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, for the contributions of those who did not dwell in Jerusalem are not mentioned till v. 6), *to give the contribution for the priests and Levites* (Neh. xiii. 10), *that they might hold fast by the law of Jehovah*; *i.e.* in order that they might discharge the duties imposed upon them, and be released by their incomes from the trouble of maintaining themselves by their own exertions, cf. Neh. xiii. 10 sqq.—V. 5. הדבר is the king's commandment in v. 4. *The first-fruits* were assigned to the priests, Num. xviii. 12, 13, *the tithes* to the whole of the tribe of Levi, vv. 20—24.—V. 6. *The sons of Israel* are the inhabitants of the northern kingdom; *the sons of Judah, who dwell in the cities of Judah*, are the inhabitants of the southern kingdom, with the exception of the inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem. To the tribe of Levi all the *kodashim* were given, *which had been consecrated to Jehovah*, Num. xviii. 8. These kodashim were sacred gifts, v. 19. In this chapter they are mentioned in v. 12 along with the tithes, but that differs from the present verse in which the tithe of the consecrated things is said to have been delivered. The Vulgate has copied the text as we have it; but the translators of the Septuagint appear to have read וְעֵז וְהַקָּדָשִׁים for in addition to the tithe of the oxen and sheep they mention also a tithe of the goats. ערמות ערמות, *they laid in heaps*, and even *in many heaps*, the fruits, which were offered as first-fruits and tithes.—V. 7. ליסד with Dagesh in the *Samech* (cf. *Ewald* Lehrb. 245 a.); it also occurs without the Dagesh in Is. li. 16. In the third month, that is immediately after the end of the wheat-harvest, they began to lay the foundation of the heaps, *i.e.* to deposit the under layer, and in the seventh month, that is at the close of the fruit-time and vintage, they had finished. The summer-harvest festival was kept in the third month, and the feast of the ingathering of corn in the seventh.—V. 9. *Hezekiah questioned the priests and Levites concerning the heaps*; to ascertain whether the amount of first-fruits and tithes was sufficient for the maintenance of the priests and Levites.—V. 10. *Azariah the high priest of the house of Zadoc*, the prince of the house of God, v. 13, is possibly the Azariah mentioned in chap. xxvi. 17. He cannot be the high priest Azariah referred to in 1 Chr. v. 39, for the latter was a

son of Hilkiah, the high-priest in the time of Josiah; see chap. xxxiv. 9, 2 Kings xxii. 4. לְהָבִיא for לְהָבִיא, also found in Jer. xxxix. 7. The infinitives *to eat and to be satisfied, and to leave in abundance*, are used in a lively discourse for the first person plural. Moreover, in a spirited address the אֵת before הַמּוֹתָר הַזֶּה does not appear strange, for *that which is left* means *we have left* this large quantity.—V. 11. This passage leaves it uncertain whether new rooms were built, or the old ones fitted up as stores for the corn and fruits.—V. 12. תְּרוּמָה is the name applied here to the first-fruits. *They brought in . . with safety*, acting both carefully and honestly in the matter, chap. xix. 2. *Over them;* over the first-fruits, &c. *Shimei*, chap. xxix. 14. V. 13. *Jehiel* and *Mahath* are also mentioned in chap. xxix. 14.—מִיַּד *by the side*, in the same sense as עַל יַד v. 15. בְּמִפְקָד must mean *according to the arrangement;* it occurs in 1 Chr. xxiv. 6, and Ezek. xliii. 21, with a different meaning.—V. 14. *The door-keeper to the east*, see 1 Chr. ix. 18. He was over the *freewill offerings of God, i.e.* over all that had been voluntarily offered to God (Deut. xii. 17), *to give the lifting of Jehovah* (that is the share, of the thank-offerings for example, which was actually the property of Jehovah, and had been handed over by him to the priests, Lev. vii. 14, 32, x. 14, 15; Num. v. 9), *and the most holy things*, the portion of the sin-offerings, &c., which had to be eaten by the priests in a holy place; see for example Lev. vi. 10, 22, vii. 6.—V. 15. *Eden*, chap. xxix. 12. The men, whose names are given here, were in the priests' cities with a trust, namely to distribute to their brethren in the divisions, who dwelt in the priests' cities and were unable to come to the temple on account of their youth or their age, their proper share of the free-will offerings. כִּגְדוֹל כְּקָטֹן, not *as to the higher so also to the lower* (Rambach), but as to the old men, so also to the children.—V. 16. *Besides their list of males* (with the exception of those whose names were contained in the list) *from three years old and upwards*, namely the list *of all those who came into the house of Jehovah for the portion set out for them every day* (cf. Neh. xi. 23), *for their service in their offices according to their divisions.* The children were allowed to go into the temple if they were over three years of age, and could therefore receive and eat the portion allotted to them in the place of the sanctuary

as well as the priests who performed the service.—V. 17. The sign of the accusative וְאֵת is used here to give prominence to the word upon which the emphasis falls (*Ewald*, Lehrb. p. 570): *as for the list of priests*, it was *according to fathers'-houses*, and for that *of the Levites, those from twenty years old and upwards were in their offices. From twenty years old*, see 1 Chr. xxiii. 24.—V. 18. After the parenthetical clauses in vv. 16 and 17, which contain more precise details, וּלְהִתְיַחֵשׂ may be regarded as a continuation of לְהִתְ in v. 16: the men were in the priests' cities also *to register their children, &c.* לְכָל־קָהָל is subordinate: their children, namely those of the whole assembly. קָהָל must mean the corporation of priests. They were obliged to keep a register of the children, &c., that the gifts allotted to them might be regularly distributed, *for according to their trust* (v. 12) *they occupied themselves with the distribution of the consecrated things*; הִתְקַדֵּשׁ is not used anywhere else in this sense, but there is nothing to hinder our giving this interpretation to the Hithpael.—V. 19. The priests also, *who lived in* the *suburban fields of their cities* (Lev. xxv. 34), *and indeed of each particular city* (בְּ as in the accounts of the census: including every particular city), *had their own servants, who are mentioned by name* (chap. xxviii. 15, just as the inhabitants of the priests' cities are said to have had such servants, v. 15), *to give the portions to every male among the priests and to every one who was registered among the Levites.* The third person perfect הִתְיַחֵשׂ is placed after כָּל without an intervening relative, compare the similar combination in Gen. xxxix. 4.—Vv. 20—21. *Hezekiah did that which was good*, &c., *and in every work, which he began for the service of the house of God, and for the law and for the commandment seeking his God* (the infinitive with לְ as in chap. xxvi. 5), *he acted with all his heart* ("with a perfect heart" in other places, *e.g.* chap. xix. 9), *and prospered.*

Chap. xxxii. 1—23. *Invasion of Sennacherib and destruction of the Assyrian army*, cf. 2 Kings xviii. 13—xix. 37; and Is. xxxvi. —xxxvii.—V. 1. Instead of the chronological statement in 2 Kings xviii. 13, we have here only the indefinite connecting formula: *after these things*, &c. וְהָאֱמֶת, *and after this fidelity* (chap. xxxi. 20), which Hezekiah had shown in the restoration of the worship of God. *And he thought to conquer them for him-*

self; according to 2 Kings he succeeded in taking the fortified cities. Our historian does not mention this, or the event recorded in 2 Kings xviii. 14—16, in order that he may not weaken the narrative of the miraculous deliverance of the Jewish state during the reign of this pious king, by a description of the misfortunes which befel Hezekiah at the commencement of the Assyrian war.—Vv. 2—8. This account of the fortification of Jerusalem, and the preparations for resisting the Assyrians, is only given in the Chronicles. It is confirmed, however, by Is. xxii. 8—11.—V. 26 is a conditional clause: *his face being directed to war against Jerusalem.*—V. 3. *To hide the water of the fountains, which were outside the city;* by covering them over and drawing them off in subterraneous channels. *And they helped him;* by taking care (v. 4), that a sufficient number of labourers were procured for this difficult undertaking. *The brook that flowed through the midst of the land,* and which was formed by the overflowing of the water of the fountains, and therefore was necessarily dried up when the fountains were covered up and drawn off, was the brook Gihon; the *Septuagint* reading is "*in the midst of the city,*" but the reading of the text is perfectly appropriate; cf. v. 30, Jes. Sir. xlviii. 17; 2 Kings xx. 20, and *Thenius* (Stadt. § 9).—*The kings of Assyria,* the plural is used here because the thoughts of the speakers were directed not merely to the invasion of Sennacherib, but to all the future wars in which they might possibly be engaged with the Assyrians and their kings.—V. 5. ויתחזק must be explained, according to such passages as chap. xv. 8, xxiii. 1, as meaning: *He showed himself strong. He built up the wall that was broken down,* repairing the breaches, &c. (Neh. iv. 1), see Is. xxii. 9, 10. ויעל על־המגדלות; *Thenius* follows *Gesenius* and others, and renders this: *he caused to ascend* (that is, he raised the masonry) *upon the towers,* an explanation, which certainly gives a suitable meaning to the passage, but for which there is no good foundation in the words employed, for if it is necessary to supply an accusative to העלה *he brought up,* we may supply masonry, no doubt, but we may just as well supply machines for keeping off the enemy (chap. xxvi. 15) or any other object. As the words stand in the text they mean: *he ascended the towers and the outer wall outside them,* for the purpose of sur-

veying them, and making preparations for defence. There is ground, however, for questioning the correctness of the text, for the words ויעל עלי are not expressed at all in the *Septuagint*, and the translators of the *Vulgate* appear to have read ויעל עָלֶיהָ (this is the reading which *Ewald* defends); the *Syriac* and *Arabic* depart altogether from our text. It is possible that ויעל עלי may have arisen by mistake from עָלֶיהָ, and that the original reading was: *he built the whole wall—and upon it the towers, and upon them the other wall,* which ran round the lower city (see *Thenius* die Stadt § 3, 4). ויחזק as in chap. xi. 11. *Millo in the city of David,* see 1 Chr. xi. 8. On the last words see chap. xxvi. 14.—V. 6. *On the open space at the city gate;* which gate we are not told, see Neh. viii. 1, 16. *And he spoke encouraging words,* see chap. xxx. 22.—V. 7, 8. The first words resemble Deut. xxxi. 6 and similar passages. רב is not to be referred without further definition to God, and interpreted as meaning: *with us is a greater and more powerful God than with him.* On the contrary, as v. 8 clearly shows, the passage must be rendered thus: with us there is more, something greater than with him, for with him there is only human power, with us there is God, &c. *And to fight in our wars;* מלחמות in this passage is a subordinate accusative, see 1 Sam. viii. 20, xviii. 17. —V. 9. Brief summary of the accounts, which are narrated more fully in 2 Kings xviii. 17—19 a. *As he himself was near Lachish, and his whole kingdom with him;* ממשלתו not only *his princes (Gesenius* in thes.) but the whole force of his kingdom, see the more definite expression Jer. xxxiv. 1. On the situation of *Lachish* see chap. xxv. 27.—V. 10—15. Brief summary in the accounts in 2 Kings xviii. 19 b.—35.—V. 10. וישבים במצור' a continuation of the question: "*wherein do ye trust?*" meaning why *do ye sit in the vice* (according to Jer. x. 17) *in Jerusalem?*—V. 11. *To deliver you up to die by hunger and thirst;* in writing these words the historian had probably 2 Kings xviii. 27 in his mind.—V. 12. Compare 2 Kings xviii. 22, where, however, even more emphatically than in this passage, God is described as he whose *bamoth* and altars Hezekiah had taken away. The words of Kings are, "*is it not this God, whose bamoth,*" &c.; here on the other hand we have: "is it not this Hezekiah, *who*

has taken away his bamoth, &c., namely those of the God mentioned in the previous verse. By *one altar* (2 Kings: *this altar*) a more distinct reference is made to the exclusive validity of the worship in the temple, which had once more been established by Hezekiah.—Vv. 13, 14. See 2 Kings xviii. 35. The original words are found in Is. x. 8—11, but Is. xxxvi. 20, and more particularly Is. xxxvii. 11—13, appear to have floated before the mind of the historian. *Who is there among all the Gods of these nations, who . . . . . who was powerful enough to deliver . . . . . that your God should be strong enough to deliver you out of my hand?* in other words, as the Gods of the more powerful heathen nations are stronger than your God, and yet could not deliver, so will your God, even if he wish to do so (and according to v. 12 this is by no means to be expected) not be able to deliver you.—V. 15. The first clause resembles 2 Kings xviii. 29, 32. In addition to reviling the God of Israel (cf. Is. x. 14, 15) he adds still farther: for there was no God of any nation and kingdom (1 Kings xviii. 10) who was able to rescue his people, . . . *and that your God will not save you out of my hand!* (we may easily supply: "is quite certain)." In this way we must explain אף כי, which introduces the antithesis to an earlier negative clause; see on the other hand Ezek. xv. 5.—V. 16. *His servants;* see v. 9.—V. 17. Compare 2 Kings xix. 14 and 10—13; Is. xxxvii. 10—14.—Vv. 18, 19. After the parenthetical remark in v. 17 the acts of the servants of Sennacherib are farther described; compare 2 Kings xviii. 26—35; Is. xxxvi. 11—22. The historian expressly states why the servants of the Assyrian king spoke loud and in the Jewish tongue, intending by this explanation to indicate to his readers the subject of the address, which he did not think it necessary to communicate in full. *To affright them;* the infinitive of the Pual occurs in Neh. vi. 19 also (cf. v. ix. 14). *As against the Gods of the nations of the earth, the work of men's hands;* see 2 Kings xix. 18.—V. 20. Compare 2 Kings xix. 15—34 and Is. xxxvii. על זאת *with reference to this, i.e.,* with reference to the contempt shown to the God of Israel, to which reference is so emphatically made in the prayer of Hezekiah (2 Kings xix. 15 sqq.) and in the words of Isaiah v. 22 sqq.—V. 21. Cf. 2 Kings xix. 35 sqq.; Is. xxxvii. 36 sqq. The words, "*with all*

the brave warriors," refer to the common soldiers in distinction from the *princes and leaders* (see for example chap. xvii. 14); hence the entire number of the dead is not given here, on the contrary it is expressly stated that even the princes and leaders were not spared. The deviation from the account in Kings is therefore very small. מִיֹּצְאֵי (Keri) compounded of מִן and the plural of יֹצֵא, *some of those who proceeded from his bosom,* in other words some of his sons. יֹצְאָיו is a Kal participle in the intransitive form for יֹצְאָיו. The Kethib can hardly be satisfactorily explained as it stands in the text; it was probably written originally מִיֹּצְאָיו, some of those who had proceeded, מִן being attached to the perfect without an intervening relative, cf. chap. i. 4; 1 Chr. xv. 12.

V. 22. After the word *all,* some MSS: read אֹיְבָיו *his enemies.* The *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* follow our text; in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* (from the hand of all round about) the word וַיְנַהֲלֵם is omitted. This word is quite unintelligible, for if we should render it, God *led* Hezekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem carefully as a shepherd leads his flock, מִסָּבִיב would be unsuitable. The reading adopted in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* is וַיְנַח לָהֶם, and this we must accept as the original text, not only because it could easily have given rise to our present reading, but because the same expression is so frequently employed by our historian (*e.g.* chap. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 30; cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 18). We observe further that the verse before us gives merely a general outline of the account contained in 2 Kings xviii. 7, 8.—V. 23. Among the *many,* who brought presents to Hezekiah, were the Babylonian ambassadors (2 Kings xx. 12), and therefore we are not warranted in concluding that *the many, who brought gifts to Jehovah at Jerusalem,* were all of them Israelites, especially as the verse concludes with a reference to the honour in which Hezekiah was held by *all the heathen* after his rescue from the Assyrians. Heathen inhabitants of Palestine (*e.g.* the Philistines, who were delivered from a powerful enemy by the destruction of the Assyrian army), might be induced to send gifts to the God, who was worshipped in Jerusalem, the city that had been so miraculously spared. On the presents, which were brought to Hezekiah, see chap. xvii. 10 and xx. 29.

V. 24. *Hezekiah's sickness.* Compare 2 Kings xx. 1—11, and Isaiah 38. (See the commentary on Kings).

Vv. 25, 26. *Pride of Hezekiah.* Compare 2 Kings xx. 12—19, and Is. xxxix.—V. 25. *Hezekiah did not render* to God *according to the benefit done to him, for,* though he promised in his sickness to walk humbly (Is. xxxviii. 15), *his heart became proud* after he recovered. His pride showed itself in the fact, that he displayed all his treasures to the Babylonian ambassadors, not merely from vanity, but, as *Thenius* observes, that they might see the extent of his resources, and be convinced of the worth of an alliance with him. "*And there was wrath upon him,*" which necessarily fell upon his people also on account of the close connection between the king and the nation (compare the wrath which fell upon Israel when David numbered the people, 1 Chr. xxvii. 24; 2 Chr. xix. 10); but the next verse appears to show that the inhabitants of Jerusalem also rendered themselves guilty by their proud behaviour.—V. 26. The words "*in the days of Hezekiah*" call to mind the expression used by Hezekiah in 2 Kings xx. 19. The fact that the wrath of God was excited is evident from the word of God by Micah: Zion shall be ploughed as a field, &c., but his wrath did not break out, because Hezekiah feared Jehovah and prayed to him, or, as it is expressed here, humbled himself.

Vv. 27—31. *Hezekiah's wealth and prosperity.*—V. 27. cf. 2 Kings xx. 13 and Is. xxxix. 2.—V. 28. Like David and Uzziah (1 Chr. xxvii. 25 sqq. and 2 Chr. xxvi. 10) Hezekiah had large stores of corn, &c., and numerous herds. אֲרֻוֹת, and at the end of the verse אֲוֻרוֹת, apparently in the same sense: *stalls for all kinds of cattle and herds for the stalls;* the first form occurs in chap. ix. 25 (with but a slight variation) and 1 Kings v. 6; the latter we do not find anywhere else, nor can we say in what relation it stands to the former, for whether it arose from a transposition of the letters, or is to be referred to a somewhat different root, and therefore has a slightly different meaning (*e.g.*, hurdles for sheep) we cannot tell.—V. 29. עָרִים; in this connection, "*towers for the watchmen of the flocks*" (cf. chap. xxvi. 10); according to 2 Kings xvii. 9 the term עִיר, which denoted any enclosure, might also be applied to them.—V. 30. *And this*

same Hezekiah shut up, &c.; reference is emphatically made here, as in 2 Kings xx. 20, at the close of the history of Hezekiah, to the aqueduct which he made, and which had already been mentioned in vv. 3, 4. *He conducted the water underneath* (below the ground) *to the west of the city of David;* see chap. xxxiii. 14. *And Hezekiah prospered;* chap. xxxi. 21; 1 Chr. xxix. 23.—V. 31. The account of his conduct towards the Babylonian ambassadors (vv. 25, 26) appears to be at variance with the statement that he was prosperous *in all that he did,* for did they not come to Jerusalem to his hurt? The question is answered thus in the verse before us: *and accordingly God left him to the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon—to prove him, and find out his whole heart, i.e.,* God permitted the ambassadors for a moment to take possession as it were of Hezekiah, and draw away his heart from God; he did this, however, not for the purpose of bringing him into misfortune, but to put him to the test, and see whether he was ready to confess his fault and humble himself. וכן, not in an antithetical sense, *and yet,* but rather to show the connection with the previous sentence, and to point out one of the results. The *melizim* were the ambassadors themselves, who are called quite indefinitely ambassadors, Babylonian princes, because all that was required was to describe them as Babylonian. *Thenius* is of opinion that the persons referred to were attachés of the ambassadors (in other words of the princes of Babylon), who made enquiries on their own account concerning the sign (v. 24); but the meaning of this verse evidently is, that the ambassadors of the astronomical Chaldaeans came to Jerusalem, to make enquiries as to the miraculous sign, which had occurred in *the land* of Palestine, and had excited the notice of the Babylonians.

Vv. 32, 33. *His goodness,* which is also mentioned in the case of Josiah (chap xxxv. 26) means his pious deeds, see Neh. xiii. 14.—The statement that Hezekiah was not buried in the family sepulchre of the descendants of David, but *by the road that led to* the sepulchre, we only meet with here. *Thenius* (on 2 Kings xx. 21) conjectures that there was no room for Hezekiah in the family sepulchre, and therefore a private tomb was constructed for him, and for the kings that succeeded him.—*And*

showed him honour at his death, &c.; these words suggest particularly the burning of many spices, compare chap. xvi. 14 and xxi. 19.

14. CHAP. XXXIII. 1—20.

MANASSEH.

Vv. 1—10. *His idolatry;* compare 2 Kings xxi. 1—16.—(See the commentary on Kings.)

V. 11—13. *His imprisonment in Babylon, conversion and return.* V. 11. בחוחים does not mean they took Manasseh, who was hidden *among the thorns* (1 Sam. xiii. 6), nor they took him *with hooks* (in other words, by stratagem), and certainly not "they took him at a place called *Chochim*, which is not met with anywhere else" *(Thenius)*; but לכד ב has nearly the same meaning as אסר ב which follows, and חוחים means *fetters*, the explanation adopted in the Septuagint, *Vulgate*, and *Targum*, and by Jewish expositors.—V. 13. The prayer which Manasseh offered in his distress is said, in vv. 18—19, to have been recorded both in the history of the kings of Israel, and also in that of the prophet Hozai, where there was no doubt a full account of Manasseh's captivity. Whether the prayer of Manasseh, contained in the Septuagint, was taken from these works, we cannot tell. The *Targum* and *Georgius Syncellus* contain miraculous accounts of the deliverance of the king, which were probably copied from an apocryphal work composed at a later time. We have no further particulars in the Old Testament respecting his escape; but this is not to be wondered at, as the Books of Kings merely contains a very short notice of the whole of the period embraced by the reigns of Manasseh and Ammon. We agree with *Ewald*, *Thenius*, *Keil*, and others, in their opinion that the release of Manasseh took place in the reign of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon. Manasseh may have been taken to Babylon by the Assyrians; for, according to an account of *Abydenus* quoted in *Eusebius*, Sennacherib had again succeeded in subjugating the Babylonians.

Vv. 14—17. *His plans for securing the safety of his kingdom and restoring the worship of God.*—V. 14. *He built an outer wall from the city of David westwards* (the direction may have been given thus, on account of the wall stretching first of all towards the north-west, and from the north-west corner of the city of David) *to Gihon in the valley, and thence to the fish-gate* (at the north-eastern corner of the lower or new city), *and he enclosed the Opel* (carrying the wall from the north-east corner towards the south and then round the Opel, which Uzziah and Jotham had already done something to fortify), *and he made the wall very high.* It is not stated that this outer wall was begun by him (Hezekiah had already done something towards the erection of a second or outer wall, and Uzziah and Jotham towards the fortification of the Opel), but that he had it raised.—V. 15. Compare vv. 3—7; the last clause must be explained in accordance with chap. xxix. 16 and xxx. 14.—V. 16. In many MSS. and editions the Kethib is וּיבן, in other MSS. and a large number of the ancient editions the Keri is וּיבן and the Kethib וּיכן; the latter is confirmed by the Vulgate and Syriac. Probably all that the word implies is that Manasseh repaired the ancient altar by building it afresh. *Ewald* infers from this passage that Manasseh removed the altar of Jehovah from the forecourt and subsequently restored it.—V. 17. The intention of this verse is to show that Manasseh removed all the idolatrous altars, but that the unity of the worship of God was not maintained in his days so perfectly as in the time of Hezekiah (chap. xxxii. 12), since the people sacrificed to Jehovah on the *bamoth* as well, in the same manner as in the time of Jehoshaphat (chap. xx. 33). The statements in vv. 15—17, which are not found in the Book of Kings, are closely connected with the account of the release of Manasseh, they ascribe to Manasseh, after his conversion, a share in the restoration of the purer worship of God, which is ascribed in Kings to Josiah alone.

Vv. 18—20. *Conclusion.*—V. 18. *Manasseh's prayer;* see v. 13. —V. 19. *And his suffering himself to be intreated of him,* in other words, the manner in which God hearkened to him, v. 13.—V. 20. Instead of בּיתוֹ we must follow the *Sept.* and 2 Kings, and read בּגן בּיתוֹ; in 2 Kings the garden of his house is also

called the garden of Uzzah. The *Syriac* has "*in his house in the garden of the treasure,*" but very little importance is to be attached to this. *Thenius* assumes that the burial-place of Manasseh was in the hill of the Opel which was opposite to Mount Zion.

15. CHAP. XXXIII. 21—25.

AMON.

Compare 2 Kings xxi. 19—26. (See the commentary on Kings.)

16. CHAP. XXXIV. AND XXXV.

JOSIAH.

Chap. xxxiv. 1—7. *His piety; extermination of idolatry.*—Vv. 1, 2. Compare 2 Kings xxii. 1, 2. Josiah is the only king of whom it is said that *he turned aside neither to the right hand nor to the left.*—Vv. 3—7. In the eighth year of his reign Josiah began to seek God, and in the twelfth year he began to purify Judah and Jerusalem and to exterminate idolatry. These chronological notices appear to differ from the account in the Book of Kings, where the extermination of idolatry is said to have taken place after the events which occurred in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, and in the same year as those events; for the notice respecting the abolition of idolatry, in 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20, refers to the same facts as are assigned by the verses before us to the twelfth year of Josiah's reign (compare v. 4 with 2 Kings xxiii. 4—6, v. 5 with 2 Kings xxiii. 7—14, vv. 6, 7, with 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20). If it had been expressly stated in the Chronicles, that idolatry was rooted out in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, or that it was thoroughly exterminated before his eighteenth year, the chronological order of events, as described in the Chronicles, would not be the same as that given in the full and regular account contained in the Book of Kings. But in

that case the Chronicles would also be at variance with themselves, for in chap. xxxiv. 33 the complete extermination of idolatry is assigned to the same period as in the Book of Kings. But all that we find stated in v. 3 is that *Josiah began to purify Judah and Jerusalem in the twelfth year of his reign*, and this chronological notice may have induced our historian to proceed at once to complete his account of the purification of the land from idols. Subsequently, at chap. xxxiv. 33, very few words suffice to call attention to the time when the purification was finished. On the other hand, in the Book of Kings, the cleansing of the temple, which took place before the passover, afforded an opportunity for giving a general account of the measures adopted by Josiah for the extermination of idolatry, and there is nothing to hinder our assuming that the comprehensive description contained in 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20, includes such events as occurred before the eighteenth year of his reign. A strictly chronological account of the order in which the events occurred is not to be found either in the Book of Chronicles or in that of Kings; but from the information contained in the Chronicles it is evident that the abolition of idolatry commenced in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, and was completed in the eighteenth. In other respects the Book of Kings contains the more complete history of the two, but so far as the chronology is concerned it must be filled up from the Chronicles.—V. 4. cf. chap. xxxi. 1. *The pillars, which stood upon the top of them;* chap. xiv. 4. *He crushed them to powder;* v. 7, chap. xv. 16; 2 Kings xxiii. 6. הזבחים is here connected immediately with והקברים, so that the graves themselves are regarded as guilty of the crimes of those who were lying in them; we must render it rather freely: *on the graves of those who brought sacrifices to them.*—V. 5. *And bones of the priests*, which he caused to be taken out of the graves, *he burned upon their altars*, thus punishing the idolatrous priests after their death by removing them from their graves and at the same time defiling the altars, which they had maintained during their life-time.—V. 6. The Keri בְּחַרְבֹתֵיהֶם, *with their swords*, does not convey any meaning, although the Masora and the earlier Jewish expositors have taken the same view of the word. In the versions only is the general sense of the passage given. The sole reason for dividing the word into two seems to have

been, that the last part was thought to be בָּתֵּיהֶם *their houses*. The correct pointing is בְּחָרְבֹתֵיהֶם *in their ruins* (cf. Ps. cix. 10). This verse must be taken in close connection with the next, וְעַד נַפְתָּלִי introducing the continuation of the unfinished sentence: *and in the cities of Manasseh . . . as far as to Naphtali*, (yet not exactly in the cities, for the land had been full of ruins since the time of Shalmanezer, but) *in their ruins, he destroyed the altars*, &c. *Simeon* is named here along with the northern tribes, as in chap. xv. 9.—לָהֳדֵק, the perfect after *lamed*, where we should expect the infinitive; the perfect is chosen here because in that case the two verbs נתת הדק could be written side by side: *he broke, he crumbled*, that is, he broke crumbling or so as to crumble; the *lamed* is affixed according to later usage to point out more definitely the relation of the two perfects to each other.

Vv. 8—18. *Restoration of the temple and discovery of the book of the covenant.* Compare 2 Kings xxii. 3—9.

Vv. 19—28. *Deputation to Huldah the prophetess, and her address.* Compare 2 Kings xxii. 11—20.

Vv. 29—32. *Conclusion of the covenant.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 1—3.

V. 33. *Introduction of the worship of Jehovah into all the lands of Israel.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 5—20.

(For Vv. 8—33 see the commentary on Kings).

Chap. xxxv. 1—19. *Description of the passover in Josiah's eighteenth year.* A tolerably exact translation of this section, though somewhat free in certain places, is to be found in the third Book of Ezra (in *Tischendorf's* edition of the Septuagint the first Book of Ezra) chap. i. 1—22 (compare 2 Kings xxiii. 21).—The description of the passover in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxxix. 13—27) contains by no means so exact an account of the proceedings connected with the festival, as we find in the verses before us, which are of peculiar importance, since they give us a more complete picture of this festival than even the laws and regulations contained in the Pentateuch.—V. 1. The time prescribed by the law was adhered to; see on the other hand chap. xxx. 2, 13.—V. 2. *According to their watches*, arranged according to their classes (cf. chap. vii. 6); in 3 Ezra we find κατ'

ἐφημερίας. *And he strengthened them for the service of the house of Jehovah*, by words of encouragement and by instructions with reference to the duties which devolved upon them, according to the precepts of the book of the law; compare the edict of Hezekiah, chap. xxix. 5 sqq. See also Neh. ii. 18. The Kethib is הַמְבוֹנִים, a word not met with anywhere else; the Keri הַמֵּבִינִים is found in many MSS. and ancient editions as the Kethib, and is also confirmed by testimony of an early date. *Who taught all Israel*; compare Neh. viii. 9 and 7, where they are referred to as those who teach the people the law; the same expression is used in 2 Chr. xvii. 8, 9, with reference to the time of Jehoshaphat. *Those who were holy to Jehovah*; not they alone, but the priests also were holy to Jehovah (cf. chap. xxiii. 6); here, however, the holiness of the Levites is mentioned on account of the command to bring the ark of the covenant into the temple, and none but holy persons were suffered to approach it. The command, "*put the ark of the covenant into the house, &c.*," cannot be made to mean, leave it on the spot where it has hitherto been standing. On the contrary, we must suppose that on the celebration of the passover the Levites carried the ark of the covenant upon their shoulders under the impression that they were required to do so by the law, and that Josiah pointed out to them the alteration, which had taken place in this respect since the erection of the temple by Solomon; they were to be bearers of the ark no longer, all that they had to do was to put it in its place and find other duties to perform. On the question, whether the ark of the covenant was still in existence in the time of Josiah, see *Hitzig* on Jer. iii. 16 and *Thenius* on Kings. Its existence is presupposed in this passage, and neither in Jer. iii. 16 nor in any other place is it stated that it was destroyed in the time of Manasseh. *There is no burden upon your shoulders*; cf. 1 Chr. xv. 22. *Serve Jehovah, &c.* (since ye no longer need to carry the ark of the covenant) in the manner indicated in vv. 4—6.—V. 4. *And prepare yourselves after your fathers'-houses, according to your divisions*; that is in such a manner that those who belonged to the same fathers'-house should stand together in the same division; see v. 5. *By the writing of David* (cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 19) and *the writing of Solomon* we are probably to understand writings, in which the injunctions of David and Solomon

were described at length. The translators of the *Vulgate* and some modern expositors suppose that reference is made to precepts, or plans of David and Solomon, but in that case we should find a similar expression to that in chap. xxix. 25, "according to the command of David."—V. 5. The versions do not follow the words of the text very closely, hence it is impossible to detect any errors by their means. The sense must be as follows: *and stand in the sanctuary, for the separate companies of the fathers'-houses of your brethren, the men of the people, a portion of a fathers'-house of the Levites*, that is to say, in such a manner, that for every fathers'-house of the laity there should be only a portion of a fathers'-house of the Levites, cf. v. 12. But this meaning cannot be found in the words without erasing the ו before וחלקת, which we need not hesitate to do.—V. 6 *Kill the passover, and sanctify yourselves*; from this expression it is evident that there was a sanctification of the Levites, which took place after the animal was slain. It may have been performed when the blood was handed to the priests (chap. xxx. 16), and possibly it merely consisted in the fact that the Levites were required to wash themselves, before performing any further duties.—*And prepare* (the paschal lamb, v. 14) *for your brethren* (of the people) *proceeding according to the word of Jehovah by Moses*. On the slaying of the lambs by the Levites, see chap. xxx. 16—18.—V. 7. The thirty thousand lambs and kids were most likely for the poor or for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in short for such as had brought no paschal lamb. לכל הנמצא for all the *laity* who were present, to be divided among them; for the paschal lambs and oxen were presented to the priests and Levites by the princes of the house of God and by the princes of the Levites. *Of the king's possession*; cf. chap. xxxi. 3, xxxii. 29.—V. 8. *And the princes of the king, they gave voluntarily to the people, to the priests and to the Levites*; the amount of their contribution is not mentioned here; but in chap. xxx. 24 the princes of the time of Hezekiah are said to have given a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep. In the third book of Ezra the princes are not mentioned among those who made presents. Of the three princes of the house of God (chap. xxxi. 13; 1 Chr. ix. 11) *Hilkiah* was the high priest (chap. xxxiv. 9), *Zechariah*, of the line of Eleazar, was probably "the second priest" (Jer. lii. 24; 2

Kings xxv. 18); and *Jehiel* was perhaps the head of the line of Ithamar, which we know to have been in existence after the captivity, Ezra viii. 2.—V. 9. It is worthy of remark, that *Conaniah* (*Kethib;* in the third book of Ezra we find the name Ἰεχονίας), *Shemaiah* and *Jozabad* are also mentioned in chap. xxxi. 12—15 as Levites of distinction in the time of Hezekiah. No doubt the same names occur at very different periods in the priestly and Levitical families, and therefore we need not be surprised to meet with the same names in the history of Josiah as in that of Hezekiah. At the same time the very frequent recurrence of certain names seems to give support to the conjecture, that some of them were not names of individuals but names of families or fathers'-houses, which were borne by the princes or chiefs for the time-being. Shemaiah and Nethaneel may perhaps be called brothers of Conaniah, merely because they were associated with him in office. For the *Pesachim* lambs and kids were presented by the king and by the princes of the priests and Levites (after the numbers mentioned in vv. 8, 9, 2600 and 5000, we cannot supply the words *lambs* and *kids* from v. 7), and also oxen, the purpose of which is not described (compare, however, v. 13).—V. 10. *So the service was prepared, i.e.*, as v. 16 clearly shows, the preparations were completed. The last clause refers to the command of Josiah in v. 4.—V. 11. *Then* (the Levites) *slew* the passover; this verse is a direct continuation of the preceding one. *And the priests sprinkled* (the blood of the paschal lambs, which they received) *from the hand of the Levites* (cf. chap. xxx. 16), *the Levites taking off the skins;* this they are said to have done in chap. xxx. 17; but there it was merely as an exception for all who were unclean.—V. 12. *Thereupon they took off the burnt-offering* (according to the context from the lambs, after the skin had been removed); the burnt-offering, therefore, can only mean such portions of the paschal lamb as were to be burned upon the altar of burnt-offering, no doubt the same parts as were cut off and burned in the case of sheep and goats, when they were offered as thank-offerings (Lev. iii. 6—17). As these portions were burned in precisely the same manner as the burnt-offerings (cf. Lev. i. 9, 17 with chap. iii. 11, 16), they might very well be called עוֹלָה, so that this word is used here in the sense

of אִשֶּׁה, *e.g.* Lev. iii. 9. This explanation is confirmed by the words at the end of the present verse: "*and the same also with reference to the oxen.*" The oxen themselves, therefore, were not offered as burnt-offerings, but the parts appointed were cut off and burned, the rest of the flesh being cooked and eaten (v. 13). *To give them* (namely the portions cut off, which together made הָעֹלָה) *according to the divisions of the fathers'-houses to the sons of the people, i.e.*, to the laity *that they might offer to Jehovah* (הקריב means to offer, *e.g.*, the fat of the burnt-offerings, Lev. iii. 9, 14). We must suppose the following to have been the way in which this was done: all the sub-divisions of the different fathers'-houses came one after another to the altar in solemn procession, to bring to the priests the portions which had been cut off, and the priests laid these pieces upon the fire of the altar of burnt-offering.—V. 13. The flesh of the paschal lamb *they cooked at the fire, i.e.*, they roasted it, *according to the law* (Ex. xii. 7—9), which prescribes roasting for the paschal lamb alone, not for any other sacrifice. The *Kodashim* on the other hand (*i.e.* the oxen, cf. chap. xxix. 33) they cooked in *pots, kettles*, (1 Sam. ii. 14) *and* in *dishes*, in precisely the same manner as the flesh of the thank-offerings was accustomed to be cooked. From this it is evident, that the oxen were offered as thank-offerings along with the paschal lambs; hence the meal did not consist exclusively of the paschal lamb, but of the meat of the thank-offerings also, for the latter were required to be consumed on the day, on which they were offered, though the eating of them on the second day was not strictly prohibited (Lev. vii. 15—18).—V. 14. ואחר; as an adverb "*and afterward.*" They prepared it *for themselves and for the priests;* for the latter, however, merely because they were occupied with their official duties till night-time, and had no leisure to prepare it for themselves: החלבים are the pieces of fat taken from the oxen, which were also burned upon the altar, but were apparently not reckoned as part of the עולה.—V. 15. *And the singers the sons of Asaph were at their posts—and the doorkeepers at every door, they* (the singers and doorkeepers) *did not require to leave their service;* for their brethren the Levites made preparations for them and then brought them the flesh, so that they

were able to partake of it during their service and without leaving their posts.—V. 16. The emphasis is laid upon the words, "*according to the command of king Josiah.*" The expression "*all the service*" is more fully defined by the subordinate infinitives: in connection with *the preparing* (inf.) of the passover and *the offering* (inf.) of the burnt sacrifices. The עלות were the עולה and the חלבים, v. 14. There is no reference in these verses to burnt-offerings in the ordinary sense of the word. Hence there do not appear to have been any burnt-offerings presented at the passover except the continual burnt-offering, Num. xxviii. 4. The fat of the paschal lambs and of the thank-offerings must, therefore, have supplied sufficient fuel to keep up the fire on the altar of burnt offering.—V. 17. Prominence is here given to the fact that according to the law the passover was celebrated by the assembled Israelites, and immediately afterwards the feast of unleavened bread.—V. 18. In 2 Kings xxiii. 22 we find the expression "*from the time of the judges, who judged Israel;*" in the passage before us the time is fixed with greater exactness, viz. the end of the period of the judges; for Samuel was the last judge (1 Sam. vii. 15), and it is stated that there was no such passover "*from the days of Samuel the prophet.*"—*The inhabitants of the northern kingdom who were present;* the meaning of the historian is not that all Israel was present, for the greater part was in exile, but there were some of the inhabitants left behind, who came to Jerusalem to the feast of passover.—V. 19. *In the eighteenth year of his reign,* cf. chap. xxxiv. 8. *Thenius* attaches great importance to the statement found in the *Septuagint* at 2 Kings xxii. 3, to the effect that Josiah sent Shaphan to Hilkiah in the eighteenth year, in the eighth month. If this statement rests upon a historical basis, all the events narrated in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—xxxv. 19 must have happened in about the space of five months and a half. We should then have a proof that the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign was reckoned from the autumn (cf. chap. xxix. 3). The eighth month of the sacred year in the eighteenth year of his reign would be the *second* month of his eighteenth year, and the first month of the new year would be the *seventh* month.

Vv. 20—25. *The war with Necho.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 29 and 30 a, and 3 Ezra i. 23, 30.—V. 20. "All this" is more

closely defined by the clause which follows in apposition: "*after all this, that Josiah had prepared the house.*"—*Necho king of Egypt* was the successor of Psammitichus, and the Νεχαὼ δεύτερος of Manetho. He was the fifth in the series of kings of the 26th dynasty (the Saitic). The place at which the decisive battle was fought is mentioned at the outset as serving to indicate at once the direction and destination of the army: "*to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates.*" In 2 Kings we find instead the words: "*he marched to the king of Assyria to the Euphrates* (this is the reading of the *Septuagint* in the present passage), whether with the intention of fighting or of assisting him the text does not enable us to determine with absolute certainty. The decision of this point rests upon the question, what king is referred to by the name of the king of Assyria, whether *Nabopolassar*, "who might be called *king of Assyria* as being the actual ruler of the old Assyrian monarchy" (*Thenius*), or *Sardanapalus*, the last king of the Assyrian empire? In modern times *v. Gumpach* (die Zeitrechnung der Bab. u. Assyr. p. 146—147) has pronounced it impossible that any other king than Sardanapalus can be intended. In this case the design of Necho must evidently have been to assist the king of Assyria, and oppose the Medes and Babylonians, for which purpose he marched to the countries of the Euphrates (this is the explanation given by *Josephus* Ant. x. 5, 1). But although we are obliged, as I think, to regard this as the design of the expedition, the king of Assyria mentioned in 2 Kings must still be Nabopolassar, for according to settled usage the rulers over the Syrian provinces are always called kings of Assyria. If Nabopolassar is intended, עלה על in 2 Kings must mean he *marched to fight against* (as for example 2 Kings xvii. 3), and this explanation is certainly more natural than the other: he marched to his assistance. *Josiah went out against him*; the battle was then fought in the plain of Kishon, from which we may conclude that Necho had brought his troops to Palestine by water, and landed them somewhere near *Akko* (cf. *Herodotus* 2. 159). אתה is an emphatic repetition of the suffix (cf. chap. xxviii. 10). בית מלחמתי would mean "*my warlike house,*" (1 Chr. xviii. 10, and xxviii. 3), which, however, would hardly denote the house which is at war with me or my hereditary foe (*Keil*). According to 3 Ezra i. 27 and *Josephus*,

the reading should be על פרת מלחמתי, *my war is on the Euphrates;* of the versions the *Vulgate* is the only one in which the word בית is adopted.—*And God has said that he will speed me;* the God, whom Josiah would not refuse to obey, therefore Israel's God, not an Egyptian God, as some modern writers infer from *Herodotus* ii. 158.—*Leave off from God;* do not resist his will, —V. 22. "*The words of Necho*" are changed into words of the prophet Jeremiah in 3 Ezra i. 26, from which we may infer, that the translator regarded the words of God, to which Necho appealed, as a prophecy of Jeremiah (we might call to mind Jer. xv. 7—9) of which Necho had heard. *In the plain of Megiddo;* according to *Herodotus* ii. 159 the battle was fought at Magdol, not far from Megiddo, cf. *Thenius.*—V. 23. *Take me away;* that is, according to v. 24, let me get down from the war-chariot; in chap. xviii. 33 Ahab says to his charioteer: *turn round and carry me away from the battle.*—V. 24. *The chariot of the second order;* here probably the king's second, ordinary chariot, in which the king could ride more comfortably than in the war-chariot, hence it is not exactly a chariot of the second rank as in Gen. xli. 43. *In the sepulchres of his fathers* (2 Kings, *in his sepulchre*); *Thenius* supposes, that it was in a chamber in the burial place of the kings which had lately been built by Manasseh, see chap. xxxiii. 20.—V. 25. And all the singing men and singing women spake *in their lamentations* (*i.e.*, in the lamentations, which they were accustomed to sing on certain days) *about Josiah* also, *and they made them* (namely such songs of lamentation) *a custom in Israel, and behold they are written in the lamentations* (a collection of dirges, which contained among others the psalm composed by Jeremiah on the death of Josiah). In this *Thenius, Keil,* and *Ewald* agree. That the historian does not refer to the canonical Book of Lamentations is evident from both the contents and style of that book.

Vv. 26, 27. *Conclusion.* Compare 2 xxiii. 28; 3 Ezra i. 31.

17. CHAP. XXXVI. 1—4.

JEHOAHAZ.

Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 30 b.—35; 3 Ezra i. 32—36.—V. 1. By the will of the people, *Jehoahaz*, who is also called Shallum, was chosen king in the room of his father, although he was not the first-born. "The people, who were anxious to exclude the elder son from the government, appear to have been aware what they had to expect from him." *Hitzig*, on Jer. xxii. 10—12.—V. 2. *He reigned three months*; it was probably on account of the shortness of his reign that he received the name of Shallum (Jer. xxii. 22), as he was called so after the other kings of this name who reigned in the northern kingdom, 2 Kings xv. 13.—V. 3. According to 3 Ezra מֶמְלָךְ should be supplied before the words "in Jerusalem." In the verse before us it is stated that "*the king of Egypt removed him from the government in Jerusalem.*" The *Vulgate* alone renders the last words "*cum venisset in Jerusalem.*" In the other versions and in 3 Ezra it is not stated that the king of Egypt came to Jerusalem to depose Jehoahaz. According to the more precise account in 2 Kings, the Egyptian king stayed at *Riblah*, on the Orontes, after he had defeated Josiah; Jehoahaz came to him (whether he came willingly or was treacherously decoyed there we cannot tell), was taken prisoner in Riblah and led away as a prisoner to Egypt. Our history will be by no means at variance with this, if we supply מֶמְלָךְ in the text. *Keil* assumes that the king of Egypt came to Jerusalem, deposed Jehoahaz, and then took him away as a prisoner, and put him in chains in Riblah (see *Thenius*).—V. 4. Eliakim was the elder brother of Jehoahaz; the Egyptian king did not confirm Jehoahaz, who had been chosen king by the will of the people, no doubt because he expected a more ready submission from Eliakim, and a more thorough departure from the principles of Josiah's government.—"*And took him*" (2 Kings, "*and he came;*") the two statements amount to the

s me thing. In 2 Kings it is added "*and died there*," cf. Jer. xxii. 12. If we do not find the fact that Pharaoh Necho had been in Jerusalem recorded in our third verse, it is not improbable that he visited Jerusalem at this time for the purpose of making Jehoiakim king. But it is not of the city of Jerusalem that the capture is described in *Herodotus* ii. 159, for the great city of Kadytis is not Jerusalem, but *Gaza* (cf. *Hitzig*, Geschichte und Mythol. der Philistäer p. 95 sqq. and *Thenius* on Kings).

18. CHAP. XXXVI. 5—8.

JEHOIAKIM.

Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 36—xxiv. 7; 3 Ezra i. 37—41.—V. 6. *Nebuchadnezzar* is the name, which ordinarily occurs in the Chronicles, the Books of Kings, and some chapters of Jeremiah; but we also meet with Nebuchadrezzar here and there in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and even Nebuchadrezzor in the Kethib of Ezra ii. 1 and Jer. xlix. 28. The latter spelling corresponds to the Greek *Ναβουκοδρόσορος* in *Eusebius* and other authors, and bears a great resemblance to the inscriptions discovered by *Rawlinson*, though they have not been deciphered with complete certainty. *And he bound him with chains* (cf. chap. xxxiii. 11) *to lead him* (לְהוֹלִיכוֹ) *to Babylon*; the reading must be retained though the *lamed* is not expressed in 3 Ezra, the *Septuagint*, and the *Vulgate*. Are we to gather from the infinitive with *lamed* that Nebuchadnessar did not carry out his intention of leading him away, or is the meaning of the passage rightly given in 3 Ezra, the *Vulgate* and the *Septuagint*, where it is rendered somewhat as follows: *he bound him with chains and led him away* (cf. Dan. i. 2)? These questions cannot be decided with certainty from the words of the text. *Movers* is of opinion that if Jehoiakim was not actually led away to Babylon, and if our historian had intended to say this, he would have expressed his meaning more clearly, and would probably have added that it happened on account of his sins. *Keil* writes to the same effect (p. 24).

And certainly if we compare the words of our historian in chap. xxxiii. 11, we shall be inclined to conclude that he purposely selected the infinitive with *lamed* because he did not intend to say that Jehoiakim was really led away to Babylon. Later writers, on the other hand, who were desirous of making this expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jehoiakim the commencement of the captivity, might easily interpret the passage before us as meaning that Jehoiakim was actually led away. There was nothing in the statement contained in 2 Kings xxiv. 6 to disconcert them, for it is easy to reconcile the fact of his being carried away with his death and burial near or in Jerusalem, if we suppose that he was taken prisoner or led away to Babylon, that he remained there in captivity, but subsequently obtained permission, as Manasseh had done before him, to return to Jerusalem, where he assumed the reins of government as a vassal of the Chaldaeans. In this manner the Septuagint combines together the removal to Babylon and the burial in Jerusalem; for in v. 6 of this chapter we find an account of the former, and the burial of Jehoiakim in the garden of Uzzah is mentioned in v. 8. In the same way we find in Dan. i. 2 a notice of the removal of Jehoiakim in the third year, or shortly after the third year of his reign, from which it necessarily follows that he afterwards returned to Jerusalem, since the author certainly did not intend to contradict the account contained in the Book of Kings and in the Chronicles, of Jehoiakim's eleven years' reign. But all that can be inferred from this is, that at a later period the word לְהוֹלִיכוֹ was supposed to imply that Jehoiakim was really led away, as the *Vulgate* and 3 Ezra evidently assume, not that our historian intended this. In our opinion the verse before us refers to the same events as 2 Kings xxiv. 1, viz. to the first expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Palestine not long after the battle at Carchemish, which was followed by the defeat of Jehoiakim and his three years' servitude. The words "*he became his servant.*" merely state that he became tributary to him, not that he was led away. In 2 Kings xvii. 3 they simply denote dependence or tributary subjection; and in chap. xxiv. 1 we cannot infer that they mean anything more from the words, "*then he turned and rebelled against him.*" These words do not imply (as *v. Gumpach* imagines), that after an imprison-

ment of three years in Babylon he returned and revolted; on the contrary, according to a fixed usage of speech, they state that, after being the servant of Nebuchadnezzar, he once more renounced his allegiance. There is no discrepancy, therefore, between the account before us and 2 Kings xxiv. 1; for, whilst it is stated here that Nebuchadnezzar set out to lead him away, the result of the expedition is more distinctly given in 2 Kings, viz. that Jehoiakim became subject to him. When did this happen? Certainly before the death of Nabopolassar, which occurred in the year 604, and after the battle at Carchemish, for Nebuchadnezzar could not possibly have undertaken his expedition to the land of Palestine and the neighbouring countries as far as the Egyptian frontier before the death of Pharoah Necho. Moreover, we learn from *Berosus* (in *Josephus contra Apion*, i. 19) that Nebuchadnezzar occupied the countries on this side of the Euphrates with his troops, as far as the Egyptian frontier, before the death of Nabopolassar, and that when he hurried back to Babylon with a few of his soldiers on receiving the tidings of his father's death, he delivered the prisoners belonging to those countries, among whom Jews are expressly named, into the charge of his friends, who were to bring them to Babylon. It is true that he is called *Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon*, both in this passage and in 2 Kings, but we cannot infer from this that the expedition did not take place till after the year 604, when Nebuchadnessar actually succeeded his father in the government, for "Nebuchadnezzar, the general, is called king by the Hebrew historians (also Jer. xxv. 1) the very first time they have occasion to mention his name" (*Hitzig* on Dan. i. 2), and similar anachronisms are by no means rare where titles are concerned. It is certainly very difficult to determine with greater precision the period in which this first expedition of Nebuchadnezzar occurred.—V. 7. *Of the vessels of the house of Jehovah Nebuchadnezzar carried* (some) *away to Babylon*: a similar account is given in Dan i. 2, where we find it stated that he had them taken into the treasury of his god; according to the passage before us he brought them into his (*i.e.* the royal) palace; cf. Dan. v. 2—3. *Hitzig* (on Dan. i. 2) says, "the statement contained in this verse probably rests upon a confusion of the names Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin." This is possible, at least we are not

in a position to determine more exactly the source from which it was taken. But it must be borne in mind, that our historian makes a distinction between *some vessels*, which were carried away in the time of Jehoiakim, and *the costly vessels of the house of Jehovah* mentioned in v. 10, and there is nothing at all improbable in the delivery of vessels by Jehoiakim, for when he became the servant of Nebuchadnezzar he must certainly have agreed to pay him tribute, and under such circumstances the Jewish kings were accustomed to have recourse to the treasures of the temple.—V. 8. *And his abominations, which he had committed*; this refers, not so much to his evil deeds (*e.g.* 2 Kings xxiv. 4) as to the idols which were made by his orders (cf. Jer. vii. 9, 10; Ezek. viii. 17), for the following words refer to his evil deeds: "*and that which was found in him*" (cf. chap. xix. 3). Jewish expositors have supposed that the latter words contain a reference to signs and figures, with which he had covered his body in honour of the idols.—Our historian passes quickly over the calamitous times of Jehoiakim; he merely intended to record the event, which gave to his reign the character of an epoch, viz. the subjugation of Jehoiakim by Nebuchadnezzar. Every thing that happened both before and after this subjugation he passes over. He does not even speak of his death and burial. As in the case of Ammon (chap. xxxiii. 21—25) the burial of Jehoiakim could very properly be left unnoticed in a history so intentionally brief as the present.

19. CHAP. XXXVI. 9, 10.

JEHOIACHIN.

Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 8—17; 3 Ezra i. 41—44.—V. 9. *Eight years*; this is the reading adopted in the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and 3 Ezra. In 2 Kings we find *eighteen years*, both in the Hebrew text and many of the versions; a few MSS. have the same reading in this passage, and of the versions the Syriac, the Arabic, and many MSS. of the Septuagint. In 3 Ezra also Josephus says that *eight* many of the MSS. have *eighteen years*. Th

may have sprung from eighteen through a copyist's error. But we look upon *eight* as the original reading, as *Hitzig* also does in opposition to *Thenius*, who lays too little stress upon the introduction of his mother's name in 2 Kings xxiv. 12, 15, Jer. xxviii. 26, which is evidently intentional, and from which we conclude that she acted as guardian over the young king. (For the rest see the commentary on Kings.—Tr.)

20. CHAP. XXXVI. 11—21.

ZEDEKIAH.

Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 18—xxv. 21; Jer. lii.; 3 Ezra i. 44—55.—V. 13. cf. 2 Kings. xxiv. 20. *Who had made him swear by God;* in Ezek. xvii. 13 it is expressly stated, that Nebuchadnezzar administered to Zedekiah an oath of fealty, when he made him king, on which occasion he will naturally have made him call his God to witness. Hence by his rebellion Zedekiah broke the oath which he had sworn by Jehovah, and Jehovah punished him for his perjury. *Zedekiah* might be the subject of the verb "*hardened,*" but according to Deut. ii. 30 the words should be interpreted thus: *God made him stiffnecked and hardened his heart,* so that in spite of the warnings of the prophets *he did not return to Jehovah the God of Israel.*—V. 14. The princes of the priests and the people are here charged with idolatry and the desecration of the temple, from which, however, it does not follow, that the historian referred exclusively to princes of the priests and to the people in the time of Zedekiah, who were not liable, so far as we can gather from the Book of Jeremiah, to the reproach of idolatry. He is rather intending to point out the criminality of the whole nation, especially in the time of Manasseh, evidently according to the representation given in Ezek. viii. (cf. *Hitzig*). The *princes of the priests* are referred to in Ezek. viii. 16 seq.—V. 15. *For he spared, &c.*; namely, inasmuch as he did not immediately inflict the punishment, but continued ag[illegible]d again to send his prophets to call to repent-

ance.—V. 17. The subject of all the verbs in this verse is Jehovah. *And God slew their youths in the sanctuary;* thus the temple, which the Israelites had polluted by idolatry, he for his part polluted by the blood, which he caused to be shed there (cf. chap. vii. 20.)—V. 21. *The word of Jehovah by Jeremiah* is the prophecy, according to which the supremacy of the Chaldaeans was to last seventy years, Jer. xxv. 11, 12; xxix. 10. The period, at which the captivity terminated, is mentioned in v. 20; the same period is indicated here in the following terms: *until the land had finished her years of rest, all the days of the desolation she rested, that seventy years might be fulfilled.* According to this passage the captivity lasted seventy years, as Jeremiah had foretold, that is to say, the captivity in the strictest sense of the term, for seventy years of desolation are spoken of here. The captivity is no doubt reckoned from the third year of Jehoiakim, just as in Dan. i. 1, viz. from the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in v. 6. But when it is said that the land was desolate for seventy years, the general statement of the prophet is taken as the measure of a chronological reckoning, which is not strictly in harmony with the historical records. The Sabbatical years terminated, according to our historian's representation, at the end of the captivity or in the year 536. Now if the seventy Sabbatical years had been celebrated according to the law laid down in Lev. xxv. 1—7, they would have spread over a period of 490 years, that is, if one were kept every seven years. Hence the year 1000 must be taken as the period at which the Sabbatical years ceased to be celebrated, that is to say, in the time of Solomon, or, as we cannot look for complete chronological accuracy, about the commencement of the monarchical period. This would be quite in harmony with chap. xxxv. 18, where the passover is said to have been celebrated according to the precepts of the law until the end of the period of the Judges.

Vv. 22, 23. Compare 3 Ezra ii. 1—5. In Ezra i. 1—3 these verses are repeated: "*That the word of Jehovah might be brought to an end,*" *i.e.*, that the period of time pointed out in that word might not be departed from; in 3 Ezra εἰς συντέλειαν. The royal will was proclaimed by means of heralds, and also by a written edict, just as in chap. xxx. 5, 6. t. 3 23. Compare

ius say at *e*

Is. xlv. 1 sqq. After the expression, *of all his people*, we have here the word Jehovah, whilst in Ezra i. 3, and also in 3 Ezra, we find יְהִי *(may he be)* instead. The latter is certainly the original reading: *whoever he be among you of his whole nation, may his God be with him, and let him depart.* The sentence, which is broken off abruptly at this point, is continued in the Book of Ezra.

00111855

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 September, 2015